The Dissertation Committee for Fatma Tarlacı Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Literary Neo-Ottomanism: The Emergence of a Cosmopolitan Turkey in World Literature

Committee:

Elizabeth Richmond-Garza, Supervisor

Katherine Arens

Erdağ Göknar

William Roger Louis

Hannah C. Wojciehowski

Literary Neo-Ottomanism: The Emergence of a Cosmopolitan Turkey in World Literature

by

Fatma Tarlacı, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2016

Dedication

To my parents

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has come to a completion with the enriching intellectual exchanges that I feel very fortunate to have experienced over the years, without which I would not have been able to reach this moment of writing my acknowledgments.

First, and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Elizabeth Richmond-Garza for her exceptional guidance, as well as her continuous and unwavering support from the very first day. Elizabeth Richmond-Garza was the very first person I met at The University of Texas at Austin. The diligence she had in her intellectual and professional work has shaped my scholarship over the years and taught me how perseverance would lead to both academic and personal success. Her expertise in the field of comparative literature has broadened my understanding of our shared discipline and helped shape how I conduct this comparative study. Through her generous intellectual support, I have been able to overcome the academic rigors associated with this dissertation while her personal and administrative support has allowed me to surpass distressing personal challenges that life has presented and notably affected my academic progress throughout my writing process. She has been so caring, patient and understanding that, I am convinced, without her backing I would not have been able to complete this degree. Though incomprehensible for me to conceive of now, there were moments in the past when I, in fact, considered giving up. During my most trying times, however, I was able to refocus and redouble my efforts thanks to her guidance, helping

me to see that my struggles were not in vain. Our productive conversations have deepened my understanding of the broader implications of my research. Her profound questions and her inclusion of commentary on my writing and research led me to gain a more sophisticated perspective through which I have then been able to form my dissertation. Her comparative, theoretical, and methodological feedback has allowed me to place this project on a solid scholarly ground. After every meeting, I have felt assured, accomplished, and full of enthusiasm to explore more and think differently to enhance the limits of my scholarship. Elizabeth, I thank you deeply and sincerely. I feel immensely grateful for the years I have shared with and learned from you.

Through his expertise in Turkish literature, Erdağ Göknar has been one of the leading backbones of my dissertation. He has inspired me with his exceptional work in the field since I presented at a conference panel that he organized in 2010. He was exceptionally kind to accept my invitation to join my committee at The University of Texas at Austin from Duke University. Guiding me with his profound knowledge on Turkey, his suggestions and feedback on Turkish literature have enabled me to refine my arguments and confidently write about the field, shaping the disciplinary approach of this dissertation. This research would not have been possible without his thorough guidance. I am genuinely grateful for the opportunity to have been able to work with him.

Ever since I took my first course with Katherine Arens during my first semester at The University of Texas at Austin, her meticulous feedback, sincere guidance, and acute observations of my work have led me to become a better writer and a more diligent researcher. Her extensive knowledge of European literature and history, as well as

literary theory, helped me formulate many of the questions that my inquiries in this project posed and expanded the disciplinary peripheries of my research. Her guidance has enabled me to become more informed about the methodological approaches and disciplinary concerns that my project would be conversing. I am deeply grateful for her support, guidance, and lucid insights that have tremendously contributed towards the foundations of this project.

I am also greatly indebted to Wm. Roger Louis for his continuous and candid support of my research and scholarship. His courses on British imperial history contributed my project in unexpected ways. My experience in working with him has allowed me to gain a historical perspective that I was able to incorporate in my research. Investigating the relationship between modern Turkish literature and the Ottoman historiography has placed my project on an interdisciplinary ground.

I am also thankful for the unceasing support from Hannah Wojciehowski, who has provided critical insights on my chapter drafts and guided me in exploring a more succinct analysis through her feedback. Her generosity with her time and patience during our meetings has assured me about the care she was always willing to provide for my research. Both the courses I have had the opportunity to take from her and the invaluable guidance she provided me throughout the writing and research process have been crucial towards my progress. I have been fortunate to work with such supportive committee members, who, through their distinguished guidance, remarkable expertise, and heartfelt personalities, have directed my progress to become a junior literary scholar.

I have also learned immensely from my peers and researchers outside my doctoral committee. The many intellectual and personal exchanges I have had with my dear friends Cynthia Francica, Bhavya Tiwari, Jayita Sinha, Julianna Leachman, Daniel Kahozi, Naminata Diabate, and Somy Kim, among many others, have allowed me to envision my academic and personal life in a world surrounded by like-minded intellectuals. I would like to thank each of them for their friendship and support at times when I felt frustrated and even lost. Our program coordinator, Billy Fatzinger, has been a great friend, and an incredible source of friendly and logistical support throughout my years at the Comparative Literature Program. His efficient working style enabled me to avoid administrative glitches, not only at the turning points of my degree plan but also when we worked together for the American Comparative Literature Association Secretariat.

I am forever indebted to my dearest friends Dilek Anıltürk and Önder Anıltürk, who have opened their doors and invited me into their family with unconditional trust and support. I would not have been able to come strongly out of the periods of tribulation if it was not for their outright friendship when mental and physical challenges made it extremely difficult for me to continue. I have been blessed with the unceasing joy their children, Selin and Kaan, brought to my life.

Many people have contributed to this dissertation, my overall academic life, and professionalization in various ways at The University of Texas at Austin. I have benefited from the generous support and mentorship of César Salgado, Douglas Bruster, Samer Ali,

as well as my colleagues at the Plan II Honors Program, Richard Reddick, Alexandra Wettlaufer, and Mary Dillman.

The Graduate School, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Program in Comparative Literature at the University of Texas at Austin have generously supported the research and writing of this dissertation. The institutional and departmental sources and personal connections to which I have been fortunate to have access have significantly facilitated the research for this project. I am grateful for the colleagues from the Middle Eastern Studies, the Department of English, and the Plan II Honors Program, from whom I have learned immensely while establishing myself as a researcher and a teacher.

My mother and siblings have been a source of support throughout my academic journey even in the distance. She has always encouraged me with her guidance. Although father was not able to see this day, he was an inspiration, and I am grateful to him for teaching me perseverance. Finally, I am grateful for Edward Andrew Jaramillo for being next to me throughout my writing process. His presence in my life and confidence in me have allowed me to continue even through the periods of frustration and doubt. He has patiently proofread and edited my work, provided invaluable insights. He often understood me even when I was not adequately clear in my written expressions by helping to flesh out ideas more clearly than I wrote out of my discursively long and intricate sentences constructed at moments of analytical densities during the writing process. I want to thank everyone who trusted in me and my contribution to knowledge.

Literary Neo-Ottomanism: The Emergence of a Cosmopolitan Turkey in World Literature

Fatma Tarlacı, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

Supervisor: Elizabeth Richmond-Garza

This dissertation offers a new reading of Modern Turkish literature as drawing on its Ottoman past and participating in a global discourse through an analysis of recent developments in Turkish literature. By developing the phrase "literary neo-Ottomanism" through a set of images that are typical of the Ottomans produced mainly in the nineteenth century and later reworked in contemporary Turkish novels, the dissertation focuses on the refractions of this Ottoman past for two Turkish authors, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk and explores how they speak to a global readership. A revival of the Ottoman past projects possibilities for a continued Turkish presence in world literature. Each writer has a distinct view of and use for the Ottoman past, and the convergences and divergences reveal much about the implications of modernism. I explore the status of Turkish literature as both a local expression and as a "world" literary tradition, through which Turkish literature seeks a place for itself in world literature while at the same time addressing the local. This exploration takes on both of these projects through a reconsideration of the Ottoman theme. I argue that the Turkish case is exceptional because of the distinct nature of the Ottoman Empire and because its demise was internally engineered.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The question of the Ottoman past has tacitly been an issue throughout the twentieth-century, particularly for Turkish scholars and literary authors. The discourse of the Ottoman past, as understood in Turkish literary circles today, entails a revised appraisal of the cultural connections between the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkish literature. As I pursue this issue in the following, I use the term "Ottoman past" to refer to what has become commonly defined among authors and scholars as both the imperial culture, including the early stages of the transition to the Republic and its revised meaning in the contemporary Turkish literary works.

This study aims to depict the literary attitude that the authors I examine present toward the Republican historiography of the Ottoman Empire, which had consciously taken a new approach toward the nation's history from the 1920s onward, and one that diverged from traditional Ottoman narratives about culture and politics. For almost a century, this conceptual divide with the Empire has caused distress in the culture and literature of Turkey because of the ways in which it altered inherited historical memories. Since the 1980s, the result of this difficulty has led the newest generation of writers to take up "the Ottoman theme," exploring the distinct Ottoman and Turkish historical

contexts of the Empire's late periods in a European framework and the transition to the Republic, all of which constitute the Ottoman theme I explore. Major works in the contemporary Turkish literature have taken up the issue of the Ottoman past from a critical perspective mainly during the last few decades and my research delves into an analysis of some of those works.

In this study, I focus on the implications of this recent view to offer a new reading of modern Turkish literature, which draws on its nineteenth-century Ottoman past and negotiates Western literary encounters while participating in a global discourse. My dissertation intervenes and complicates the debates on this recent exploration of the Ottoman theme while questioning the literary and cultural implications of this undertaking for the Turkish literary presence within world literature.

The currently considerable visibility of contemporary Turkish literature within the global literary sphere also coincides with its explorations of the Ottoman theme. Thus, it is legitimate to take up the current status of the modern Turkish literature both as a local expression and as a "world" literary tradition in the "elliptical" sense by which David Damrosch has defined it. (*What is World* 281) As I demonstrate in the chapters that follow, contemporary Turkish literature seeks a place for itself on the world stage while, at the same time, it addresses the local. It has taken on both of these projects through a reconsideration of the Ottoman theme in roughly the past sixty years, making Turkey a literary subject in many new ways, rather than simply being an object of world literary representation. This approach supports that Turkish literature and culture were already globalized even before what Haun Saussy has called "an age of globalization" (viii).

During his speech at the Nobel Prize ceremony in 2006, Orhan Pamuk said: "there was world literature, and its center, too was very far away from me. …we, Turks, were outside it,"[1] referring to a feeling from his early career as a writer. This project proceeds from this point, which considered Turkey outside world literature, giving way to the idea that has, in fact, plagued the twentieth-century Turkish intelligentsia and suggests that a decade after Pamuk's prize, contemporary Turkish literature is at a crossroads of world literature. I assert in this study that contemporary Turkish literature has found the tools to achieve this status in its revision of how the Ottoman past is understood and uses these new instruments to form, or rather reinforce, literary connections with the world.

Turkish scholar Erdağ Göknar has coined the term "literary neo-Ottomanism," as a reassessment of the Ottoman past. Göknar describes it as which the "understandings of style and aesthetics changed with the neo-Ottomanism as authors experimented with form while being drawn to the possibilities of multiethnic, multi-religious settings and characters from various Ottoman walks of life and classes" ("Orhan Pamuk" 35). The reassessment that Göknar describes would not value an absolute glorification or underestimation of the Empire's culture, but instead offers a critical reassessment of its weaknesses and sophistication. Building upon Göknar's definition of the term, I argue that while emerging into the twenty-first century literary space of the world, contemporary Turkish literature not only revises the local understanding of the disregarded cultural history of the Ottomans and redefines Turkey's cultural identity against what can be defined as the self-orientalism of the twentieth-century but it also

[1] April 23, 2014, www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2006/pamuk-lecture_en.html.

leads global readers to question their conceptions of the Ottoman culture, modern Turkey, and world literature. In other words, while I advocate Göknar's definition of what literary "neo-Ottomanism" entails, I also aim to expand it from stylistic diversity and the significance of Ottomans' multicultural settings to forming a mode of reading world literature, a method that reinforces multiplicity of the discipline.

I utilize the phrase "literary neo-Ottomanism" and develop it through a comparative literary analysis relating to some of the images of the Ottomans produced primarily in nineteenth-century Europe. Such understandings of the Empire were later reworked in the Turkish novels of my case studies as part of the attempt to put Turkish culture back on the world map. The central documents for this project are found in the refractions of the Ottoman past in the works of two Turkish authors, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk. The images drawn in these novels function as lenses which, as part of a revival of the Ottoman past, project possibilities for a continuing Turkish presence in world literature. I, thus, focus on the works of these two authors writing in different decades and with various views of both the local cultural inheritance and their potential to speak to a global readership. Each writer has distinct views of and uses for the Ottoman past, and their convergences and divergences reveal much about the implications of the project of modernism and modernization both in general and particular to Turkish understandings of these phenomena.

The case studies of the two authors focus on their engagement with the Ottoman past and a comparison of how they applied the theme in their own ways. This comparative reading allows me to detect their differences and the contribution of their

disparity to a revised image of the Ottoman Empire in the current world literary scene. Through the theoretical perspective I employ in the dissertation, I focus on the refractions of the Ottoman past for modern Turkish literature. Besides, I assess why this particular project is so appropriate to our globalized and present cosmopolitan moment.

Due to historical and cultural specificities, Turkish literature and culture make us recognize that it is different from many other national literatures that are studied through postcolonial theory because it lies outside (post)colonial perspectives and thus resists simple postcolonial readings. This difference requires a divergent approach to evaluating the dynamic that operates in Turkish literature. By revisiting the Ottoman imaginary on the level of national culture, Turkish literature engages in a different dynamic, offering readers and critics a parallel but alternative model of how imperial and post-imperial cultures present themselves globally. Turkish culture consciously transformed itself in turning toward the West and towards modernity, yet on its own terms. Thus, the Turkish case is exceptional and must be taken up in its own voice, both because of the distinct nature of the Ottoman Empire and mainly because its demise was internally engineered.

In consequence, Turkish authors are in an especially good position to speak innovatively to global circulations of power and culture, since they work on the history of a world culture whose impact as an empire has almost disappeared from memory beyond its borders, yet which has traditions of dealing with Western cultures in thoughtful, sophisticated ways. Thus, this project takes up the unique position of Turkish literature also to contribute a much-needed approach to postcoloniality, arguing that the revival of

the Ottoman past has been both productive and controversial within Turkish literary circles and abroad.

The Choice of Texts

Because the novel, particularly the realist novel, has often been closely aligned with history-writing, it is straightforward to take the novel as the genre through which I trace how contemporary Turkish literature structures its move toward the global literary stage from its historically nationalistic literary framework. The two case studies offered here that of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk consist of four novels – *A Mind at Peace*, *The Time Regulation Institute, My Name is Red* and *The White Castle* – that follow this alignment between historical narratives. However, they also reflect upon the lingering effects of this historical inheritance on contemporary Turkish literature's project of global self- and re-representation. As the reader shall see, they consciously challenge existing representations from both Ottoman and Turkish history and the West.

The comparative and contextual analysis allows me to trace these literary texts and question various global understandings of the Ottoman Empire. This new generation of Turkish literary texts differentiates itself by challenging the binary that Turkish Republican ideology promoted against the Ottoman Empire by highlighting its anti-modernity through cultural reforms after the proclamation of the Republic.[2] The so-called

[2] With the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the Ottoman Empire began to be seen as the opposite of what the modern Turkish nation was becoming. Thus, Republicans implemented a cultural revolution separating the Empire from the Republic in the new nation state during the 1920s and the 1930s.

"Young Turks" called for a new Turkey after 1908's political reforms[3] and Atatürk's Republic was partly built upon their understanding of the modern. Thus, juxtaposing these novels offers a critical comparison of local and global meaning constructions about the Empire throughout the twentieth-century. By way of comparison, I argue that contemporary Turkish literature claims space within world literature through the country's Ottoman past – using a historical narrative at least marginally familiar with the West to create its own space within but not dependent on the Western historical imagination. My analysis of the late Ottoman cultural history in these four modern Turkish novels, therefore, is a literary one, accommodating not only single works, but also their presence within existing, productive, and plural networks of translation and globalism conditioned by historical tropes and narratives about the Ottoman past. In so doing, this study aims to address the importance of Ottoman cultural legacy for contemporary Turkish literature and world literature alike.

My selection of novels reflects not only my personal judgment that considers them particularly good examples of Turkish literary works that have succeeded in their circulation outside Turkey but is also reflective of works that bring a nuanced approach to Ottoman cultural past and Turkish modernity. These examples also serve to augment larger disciplinary debates on what belongs to the canon of world literature and what its disciplinary correlation might entail for the individuality of nations that take part in such profoundly intertwined, but still differentiated spheres. The paradigms of world literature have recently been questioned to move beyond the idea of literary canons and begun to

[3] For more information on the Young Turks, see Hanioğlu (1995).

further discussions on what national representation in a world literary space might mean. My close and comparative reading of these four novels reflects my focus on their (neo)-Ottomanism and its implications. What starts as a seemingly national and historical reading ultimately reveals intriguing cosmopolitan ramifications for modern Turkey, and this interprets world literature from an inflected perspective that rests on a century-old dialogue between centers and peripheries about the Empire, the Republic, and modernization in Turkey.

The first author I selected, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962), is an early twentieth-century Turkish writer, who was "re-discovered"[4] in the 1990s when Turkish literature and culture had just begun to explore neoliberal worldviews and questioned the leftist worldview that Turkey employed during the twentieth-century. Highly criticized during the 1930s for his relatively sympathetic approach to the Ottoman Empire during the peak of Turkish nationalism, Tanpınar is now largely appreciated for his courage to raise an unorthodox voice against the local erasure of the Ottoman culture from modern Turkish life during the 1930s and 1940s. His books have been published and translated into other languages during the last few years, and his works are circulating in the world today. The trajectory that Tanpınar's Ottoman theme initiated found its reflection in critical assessments of other names in Turkish literature which offered interpretations of the Ottoman past that differed from official politics and aesthetic norms.

[4] I interpret the considerable recognition and appreciation Tanpınar's works have recently received as a re-discovery due to the previous negligence the author received.

A Mind at Peace (2008, a translation of *Huzur,* originally 1949) shows such dissidence from the 1930s and challenges the nationalist meta-narrative proposed by new political voices at the time. I argue that his works deny the assumption that there was a unanimous acceptance of Republican ideology in Turkey in the first half of the century. I suggest that audiences are again reading Tanpınar in this increasingly globalized moment because they see that one can no longer neglect the study of the Ottoman Empire as a cosmopolitan and culturally rich society that directly affected modern Turkey. Therefore, Turkey needs to explore its past thoroughly to accurately present its culture to the world in our globalized moment. This novel shows the Ottoman world right in the aftermath of its historical end in 1923 while the experience of this cultural shift was still fresh in the memory of the writer as well as in that of the society. Thus, Tanpınar's novel shows the Ottoman culture in striking detail in an attempt to synthesize[5] it with the expectations of the modern world. No matter how difficult it was to do that for Tanpınar in a cultural environment that was actively trying to erase the culture he wanted to keep, Tanpınar was able to compose a critical narrative of the past in the form of a love story, directed toward the past that was disappearing from memory.

The Time Regulation Institute (2014, a translation of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, originally 1962), on the other hand, is a disparate historical narrative that uses the literary technique of a satirical allegory of Turkish modernism and westernization. The novel presents the regulations of modernity as arbitrary and superficial choices that authorities

[5] The idea of synthesis of the traditional and the modern was a prominent one that Tanpınar expressed in various works and which I discuss further in Chapter 4.

make to adjust the new nation state to the *time* of the West. The acclaimed claim of 'Turkish belatedness' for modernity that many Turkish intellectuals once promoted and, which gave way to a sense of self-orientalism, is parodied in this novel, using the metaphor of synchronizing the clocks of Turkey with the West so there would not be any time loss from modernity. Juxtaposing these two stories produces a valuable analysis that underlines the perils of cultural loss that Turkey was going to experience throughout the twentieth century and provides a symbolic preface to Pamuk's endeavors in his Ottoman novels.

I include the analysis of *A Mind at Peace* and *The Time Regulation Institute* in this study to show Tanpınar's attempts to narrate the Ottoman past and to compare his accounts to those of Pamuk by taking into consideration their exact cultural and historical moments. This analysis also allows me to interpret the reception of their works in the world literary space and the implications of such a response for modern Turkish literature as an example of a cosmopolitan literary tradition and how local writers have responded to the Empire. These two novels reflect a preeminent representation of the writer's taking on the legacy of the Ottoman Empire, which facilitates my interpretation of the Empire's contemporary influence on Turkey's global image.

The White Castle (1990; originally *Beyaz Kale,* 1985) is not Orhan Pamuk's first novel, but it is his first "Ottoman novel." It is also his first novel in which the Ottoman Empire is questioned in a critical way. For this reason, the novel marks the beginning of an era during which contemporary Turkish literature takes a new path away from its nationalist underpinnings toward a cosmopolitan identity through a sincere embracement

of the Ottoman past. The new way of reading the past presents the possibility of alternative readings, which did not seem possible for Turkish authors during most of the twentieth-century. With this new turn to the past through a cosmopolitan approach, Turkish literature is being noticed within the world literary space, giving it a prominent place in world literature as well as forming the discipline with new perspectives. I take the novel's significance as the beginning of this process and as my point of departure in my analysis of the novel and my comparison of it to Tanpınar's works.

The novel offers a compelling interpretation of modern Turkish cultural identity by disturbing accepted notions about Turkey as being a paradoxically nationalist imitation of the West. The novel disrupts not only transnational accounts but also local ones by symbolically opening up to the Ottoman past through the archives and by presenting a history that challenges standard Turkish nationalist as well as secularists accounts of the Ottoman world, which considered the Empire as a binary of the modern. In the novel, the Ottoman is not only a diverse and vibrant culture but also an integral and continuing part of modern Turkish identity. Hence, it should not be closed up in archives.

My Name is Red (2001; originally *Benim Adım Kırmızı*, 1998) concludes my case studies. I chose the novel for its prominent narrative style that operates as an exquisite tapestry of Ottoman artistic sophistication and cultural peculiarity while also serving as a critical tribute to the Ottoman past. Undeniably, its global success contributes my decision to work on this acclaimed novel; however, it does not constitute the greater motivation I had in mind when I chose it for this study. I was intrigued by how the novel takes on the Ottoman theme as a way to bridge the past to the present and Turkey to the

world, hence, reading world literature as a global body of literary works that, at the same time, consists of intertwined, individual, local as well as cosmopolitan, and cultural organs and mechanisms. The Ottoman theme translates into an example of how such a mechanism allows contemporary Turkish literature to present itself to the world by embracing the cosmopolitan nature of the Ottomans.

These novels are, by no means, exhaustive of the Turkish literary works that have explored the Ottoman theme in heterodox ways. However, they entail prominent examples of the development of Turkish literary take on the Ottoman Empire throughout the twentieth-century. Their handling of the Ottoman theme is also a telling example of how the works of Tanpınar and Pamuk can debilitate local and global notions of the Empire as a negligible part of the past, one that does not have any influence on modern Turkey or the world. This project offers a scholarly attempt to complicate such assumptions even further by juxtaposing these two Turkish authors and claiming that the analysis of their works presents contemporary Turkish literature to a global literary ground. This perspective echoes the considerable impact of the Ottoman past as an intriguing way of reading world literature.

Literary Neo-Ottomanism and the Significance of the Case Studies:

The Need for This Project

The recent use of the Ottoman theme presents a compelling case for Turkish literature, as it enters the global circles, which also constitutes one of the underlying research questions for this study. I suggest that by acknowledging that the Ottoman theme opens a new era for contemporary Turkish literature. Last two decades have marked a particular moment in Turkish cultural history, one that can be described by the concept "literary neo-Ottomanism," as termed by Erdağ Göknar.[6] My use of the term "literary neo-Ottomanism" stresses the *literary* aspect of the phrase and does not embody the implications of "neo-Ottomanism," as a political ideology that Turkish and world politics has been pronouncing more clearly since the Justice and Development Party first came to power in Turkey in 2002. I emphasize in detail in the following section the reason why I differentiate my perspective from one that is solely based on a political ground.

As a political ideology in its broadest definition, neo-Ottomanism alludes to Turkish foreign policy that turns its face to its surrounding regions, namely the Middle East, Balkans, The Caucasus and North Africa, where the Ottoman Empire was once in power and control. This unofficial policy encourages Turkey's growing influence in the region. neo-Ottomanism in its political term indicates a significant shift in Turkish foreign policy that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk embodied through the proclamation of the

[6] See Göknar (2006)

Republic. In Kemalist ideology,[7] Turkish foreign policy incorporated westernization, which was viewed synonymously with modernization. The intentional consequence of this policy, however, was an alienation of Turkey from its regional surroundings as well as its Ottoman past. This political move that contributed to a cultural break with Ottoman culture during the first half of the twentieth-century, in fact, coincided with the historical and political divergence from the ways of Ottoman culture during the same period. The obvious current literary interest in the Ottoman past and political entanglements with the regions of the Empire manifest corollaries both in political and literary spheres, using this moment of the Ottoman history as a focus around which Turkey's future can be reconsidered.

One might argue that the notion of literary neo-Ottomanism and political neo-Ottomanism could have such general approaches in common. In this vein, the argument that the former has been influenced by the political rhetoric around the policies of the Justice and Development Party might seem reasonable. However, the two terms and their possible implications should be distinguished from each other when considering the literary scope of this project, which I also discuss in the following section, as the methodological prelude to this project. In today's Turkey, many political issues that have been taboos in the past decades, such as the Armenian issue, the Kurdish population demanding autonomy and secession, the Republican ideology, and the Ottoman past are

[7] Kemalism is often defined as the founding ideology of the Republic of Turkey. The founder of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, implemented what was later called 'Kemalist ideology' as a social, cultural, secular and political movement that separated the new Turkish nation state from the fallen Ottoman Empire by embracing westernization as a way of modernism. The ideological acts of the Young Turks influenced Atatürk to form and implement Kemalist ideology by their Ottoman nationalism and initiation of an early stage democracy. For more information on Kemalism, see (2012), and (c2011).

being actively discussed and questioned. The questioning of Republican modernism and westernization by sociologists, historians, political scientists, Turkologists, literary writers, and critics can be considered as a usual consequence of a time when concepts like globalization have become influential for the intelligentsia of a postmodern[8] world.

Literary neo-Ottomanism refocuses considerable interest in the Ottoman history and reveals opportunities for literary writers, scholars, and historians alike to examine the neglected empire and its influence under a brighter light. This study aims to contribute to such research by examining Tanpınar and Pamuk whose uses of the Empire differ, and therefore, manifest various ways that the Empire is presented within contemporary Turkish literature. On a greater scale, this project endeavors to contribute to the study of world literature as a reciprocal network between the West and non-West that function somewhat differently from is often assumed in postcolonial theory. It shows how the Ottoman theme has been generated, what processes it has undergone, and what current literary discussions are involved in its re-evaluation. Considering that the discourse of world literature and how it should be studied are still elusive and protean, it is, nevertheless, more significant than ever to have a clear understanding of how the representation of national literatures within the realm of world literature influences and is influenced by the local literary trends and historiography of that particular nation. This approach helps recognize cultural diversities that are altered, or flattened by global

[8] I approach the concept of postmodernism in Jean-François Lyotard's terms. In *Postmodern Condition* (1979), Lyotard promoted the view that everything should be open to being questioned and argued that the only thing that was certain in the world was the ambiguity and led to the contest of various phenomena that had been previously accepted.

concerns in literary circles, showing just another aspect of the relation between the global and the local.

This cultural project is by no means simply a new account of nationalism. Turkey's recent curiosity about the Ottoman world seems to be critical in its rethinking of its new, and current role on the world scene (on issues like its attempts to join the European Union), as it invites scholars to revisit certain notions still extant in the world about the Ottoman Empire. Consequently, various stereotypes have developed and some of them, still persisting in Europe, contribute to the underlying reasons for the opposition to Turkish membership. Some have also alluded to the fact that Turkey's geographic location as a point of connection has provided a pretext of plausible deniability for some Europeans who seek to continue to exclude Turkey from the European Union. By re-evaluating such stereotypes, contemporary Turkish literature aims to nullify such opposition. If Turkey is claiming its cultural history as connected to the Ottoman past, then it needs to disprove dominant Western stereotypes, such as that the Ottoman past was an epitome of backwardness, as once both Europeans and Republicans claimed. As Turkish intellectuals address major themes like westernization that shaped late Ottoman and early twentieth-century Turkish literature in a well-grounded cultural dialogue, they have again begun to situate the Ottomans in a world context, where the Ottoman state had intricate interactions with other nations and empires, such as Britain and France. These political relations are critical to how these intellectuals can understand contemporary intercultural relations in literature today.

The case studies on the works of two authors that I undertake in this study aim to contribute to the body of literature about the place of the Ottoman past within contemporary Turkish literature in an analytical way and facilitate understanding how it affects Turkish presence in the world literature. A particular strength of these case studies is that they trace different approaches to the Ottoman past throughout twentieth-century Turkish literature to show that this has been a long and far-reaching cultural debate, not simply an artifact of postcolonialism.

These authors examine Turkish identity(-ties) in the center of their works in conjunction with the Ottoman history; however, their ways of dealing with identity differ. Studying their works in tandem manifests how their re-writing of the history through literature has been productive in understanding Turkish history in a more competent and productive way. This study also contributes to a relatively unexplored issue: national history's role in world literature. Although there is an exhausting number of works published on Tanpınar and Pamuk as canonical Turkish authors, few have put them in juxtaposition, and none has thoroughly questioned the influence of the former on the latter through the perspective of Turkish literary presence within world literature. Thus, I offer this project as a contribution to the studies of Turkish and world literature, redefining it in new ways, as a conscious force within the field of world literature.

My argument about the Ottoman past signals the notion that modern Turkey, although influenced by the West in its attempts to westernize, experienced westernization through the lenses of its Ottoman past as an agent of world history. For some of the early twentieth-century Turkish intellectuals, westernization meant an interaction rather than a

passive reception of western lifestyles, as the works of the authors I examine also illustrate. In many of their works, these authors have simply refused to imitate the West, but instead, complicated their understanding of Turkish modernity by emphasizing modern Turkey's undeniable connection to the Ottoman past as the agency of its own history. This relationship today presents to the world a Turkish literature that has resurrected its cosmopolitan past and assimilated it into its present, in an attempt to again appear as a world culture. By doing so, Turkish literature offers not only different materials for readers of world literature but also a different mode of reading that shows a seemingly local past through the revised lenses of a global perception.

The recovery of the connection to the past does not mean or promote this idea that the Ottoman culture offered an ideal model for the society. On the contrary, authors like Pamuk often underlined and illustrated the atrocities within the Ottoman world through their works without bias. It is significantly different from the standard accounts of the Ottomans and even the early twentieth-century Turkey's representation in western historical and literary studies. The general attitude toward the Ottoman Empire highlights the declining centuries of the Empire. It neglects, often deliberately, its considerable impact on the world history, which was, indispensably, one of the world's strongest and most influential empires in history. By demonstratively showing how these Turkish authors dealt with the questions of modernity and the Ottoman Empire's impact on modern Turkey, I aim to show that the Ottoman-Turkish world has been a fundamental component of the Europe and contemporary Turkey. For this reason, it cannot be reduced

to being a victim of a *westernizing* world literature, but rather as a sophisticated transaction between national cultures and global ones.

I see it as imperative to revisit the Ottomans on the national level of culture, and then to project its reality onto the world stage to better understand the literary dynamics between the resources available to contemporary Turkish intellectuals and the places they claim for their literature and culture on the global stage. This project shows that Turkish literature has transcended the question of national for a new way of defining the Turkish context.

The *Literariness* of Literary Neo-Ottomanism

The Gezi Protests that took place in Turkey in May 2013 was triggered by the government's agenda to rebuild an Ottoman military barrack in the location of the park. The plan to build a barrack was only a single example of various acts, which the ruling Justice and Development Party (JDP) employed during the last decade that had a direct or indirect allusion to the times of the Ottoman Empire while reviving a sense of Ottomanism. Considering these political developments, I anticipate an association between the scope and goal of my project and what is interpreted as '*political* neo-Ottomanism' that has recently been emerging and widely discussed in political circles in and about Turkey.

I strongly differentiate my analysis of a new understanding of 'Ottomanism' in Turkish literature from the *political* interpretations of *Ottomanism*, as attributed to the recent political developments in Turkey. I firmly emphasize this distinction to inform any

misleading comparison or criticism that might associate and interpret the scope of this project with a political connotation that is directly related to the JDP's agenda. Although I do not deny the fact that politics influenced Turkish literature during the twentieth-century, I would like to emphasize that what might be interpreted as a recent nostalgic renaissance of the Ottoman theme in Turkish politics is not considered as a factor playing into the specific kind of Ottoman theme in contemporary literature that I explore in this project. Such a nostalgic reading and application of Ottoman theme falls outside the scope of this dissertation since my main argument entails and focuses on a dissimilar subject of thought, namely literature. That is the reason why the theoretical basis I undertake stresses the *literariness* of literary neo-Ottomanism that my dissertation investigates.

On Methods

In a literary study, methodological purity is not viable, nor is it an expedient way of conducting research and producing an interpretation. Thus, I have used multiple methods that not only I have considered productive but also the direction of the research has necessitated. Close textual analysis constitutes one of the methods I employ in this study while exploring how the individual texts I present the implications of the reassessment that the historical and literary accounts of the Ottoman Empire have recently been receiving. This assessment, illustrated through the novels, makes the novels more than literary works that only exist with their national identity attached to them in the global scene of world literature. I balance the close textual analysis with a

historiographical and contextual reading of the literary and cultural details of the Ottoman Empire. They complement my claim about contemporary Turkish literature's analytical *contribution* to the discipline of world literature rather than the former's *application* or *use* of the latter's elusive principles that seem to be formed by a part of the world, for the rest of it, to simply *employ*.

Close reading has informed my interpretation of the novels' contextual and rather global implications for Turkish literature in the context of world literature. The Ottoman theme has constituted a primary subject of discourse in my analysis because I locate my main emphasis on the works' global reception through the Ottoman theme, as a means of Turkish intercultural representation. Furthermore, because the Ottoman Empire has often been under- and misrepresented in standard literary, as well as cultural and historical accounts, interpretation of this matter that has become critical for new Turkish representation enacts as a crucial intervention in current debates on Turkey. My research and writing process has been attentive to questioning and expanding the existing scholarship on the literary works that I have analyzed. Thus, my investigation of the novels' place in Turkish literature has allowed me to reflect on their function not simply as works of a particular culture, but as active participants in the making of world literature.

My analysis of the novels' allegorical implications of Turkish and Ottoman contexts has required the seemingly lengthy and frequent quotations. I have provided expansive interpretation of block quotes. They are substantial to my claims about the novels that are illustrated in those quoted sections and to my general argument about their

contribution to the Ottoman-Turkish cosmopolitanism that I have investigated. Having such quotations and my interpretation of their multi-layered and complex overtones on the same page have been critical to enunciate my claims with the close reading of the relevant textual evidence.

My study entails, however, far more than just a practice of *close reading* of the novels, which New Criticism would promote as the primary method for literary analysis. Although I have taken great advantage of this method, I have also incorporated a more hybrid approach to my analysis. Aligning my investigation also with the New Historicist reading, my primary focus has been to exemplify how such a reading functions as an effective way to expose the profoundly intricate networks of a literary work and its wider implications that transition beyond the text itself. Contrary to what some literary critics might argue, I contend that reading and incorporating cultural history in a literary study does not make literary critics "amateur cultural historians" (Gallop 183). As I see it, the works and their contexts that I study function as instruments of Turkish passage to world literature. Thus, the actual textual evidence I use as a method in this study is, in fact, an example of the passage that Turkish literature makes to global networks of literature. I delineate these works' critical intervention in a broader literary context by distancing their subject matter of the Turkish-Ottoman through aiming attention at a textual level.

As a literary scholar, I characteristically value the *word* in itself and the practice of close reading. In a translated work, the translation requires an acute awareness of how the words and their meanings in the translation speak to the original. Often, idioms taken from a literal word for word translation may be lost in translation from its original

context from language to language. Far from questioning the choices that the translators of the works I study have made, but with the advantage of being proficient in both Turkish and English, I have re-read the texts in both languages and circumspectly compared sections that I quoted as well as parts of the novels where expressions in the original language – especially in the case of Tanpınar's novels which sometimes include a nuanced and often arcane Turkish – could yield to nuances of meaning in English. This comparison proved exceptionally valuable when I was able to identify such nuances and meanings in the translation that were not always present in the original and wrote my interpretations accordingly.

Immediate paths, which the future of scholarship seems to be taking, include interdisciplinary collaboration, open access, and digital humanities. This direction has begun shaping the methods of humanistic inquiry, scholarship, and pedagogy. While shaping the questions we ask, these recent developments, affecting the Humanities in general, have enriched my interpretation of doing research as well as conducting the particular research undertaken here. I strongly concur that research on the discipline of world literature will immensely benefit from new interdisciplinary tools, methods, and disciplines, such as digital humanities, have to offer.[9]

[9] I have employed only a minimal application of digital tools for this particular project, but my prospective research and scholarship in literary studies will collaborate with digital humanities to a considerable degree. Based on my judgment on the current disciplinary assessments of comparative and world literature, as well as the discipline of humanities and its methodologies, which have been going under increasing scrutiny, it is my conviction that it has become imperative for comparative and world literature scholars to participate more actively in the debates on digital humanities. Such collaboration not only helps devitalize existing misconceptions but it also allows larger scale research in the fields of literary studies to enrich the scholarly limits that any research might come across at any point during their research.

This project and my research methods are not immune to the vibrant changes the Humanities has recently been going through with the rise of digital humanities and its current and potential contribution to research, and scholarship while making me acutely aware of the academic opportunities that digital humanities has to offer to literary studies and vice versa. I cultivate the immense scholarly contribution such collaboration between interdisciplinary, twenty-first-century literacies and the Humanities can provide for the future of humanistic inquiry. This collaboration might liberate the study of literature from the chains of expanded, but still existing, canons and embrace "the great unread," as Margaret Cohen described it (23).

My perspective on close reading aligns with Andrew DuBois' words in his introduction to *Close Reading: The Reader* (2003), a collection of essays on debates over close reading, which describe it as "reading and critical response" (1). A critical response has been my objective throughout my research, and it requires *close reading*. In a way, performing a nuanced close reading of the texts through digital tools, I have systematically traced specific semantic choices both Tanpınar and Pamuk made. I have not extensively used digital methods or delved into the field of digital humanities to undertake most of my research for this project. However, I have utilized digital textual analysis portals, such as TAPoR and Voyant to carry out text mining and recognize the authors' language patterns to further inform my reading of the works' semantics, particularly in the Turkish language.

While Tanpınar was writing in the 1930s, the process of stripping the Turkish language from foreign influence was at its peak. His calculated word choice was his way

of protesting against what he interpreted as impoverishing the language. In *My Name is Red*, Pamuk employed a language that is reinforced by traditional Turkish sayings and linguistic elements of the Turkish language. His language is similar to what Tanpınar's language represents through the use of archaic words that help bring the tone of the Ottoman social life from the sixteenth-century into the text. Observing the data of such linguistic choices they made in their novels has allowed me to conduct a more informed close reading and interpret the possible reasons behind such choices. For instance, the high number of rhetorical devices and figures of speech, such as assonant doublets, in Pamuk's novels reveals his knowledge of the Turkish language and the linguistic changes it has experienced due to politics during the twentieth century.[10] He intentionally uses words that belong to the Ottoman-Turkish that modern Turkish reader often finds difficult to understand. I read such linguistic choices as part of Pamuk's effective implementation of the Ottoman theme in his story and his way of accentuating the results of the 1928 Language Reform. The information I collected through that data has

[10] While scanning parts of the novels in Turkish digitally, my intention was not to discover exactly how many idioms or figures of speech the texts had, which critics of text mining tools might assume and describe this kind of analysis as 'counting words.' I interpret such investigation as mapping associations between words. Such associations can reveal significant details about thematic patterns, uncovering a whole new range of literary questions. Additionally, I was interested in getting a general sense of how much Pamuk and Tanpınar made use of *old* words that are neither commonly used nor understood in Turkey today. Even the later edition of Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* is a prime example of such language both due to his political stance against the language reform and the fact that he wrote his novel only less than a decade after the reform when the language was still in the process of changing. Pamuk's deliberate use of words that were mainly used in Ottoman-Turkish, such as *ahar, başnakkaş, ciltçi, ciltbend, cinas, dirhem, divit, hattat, hokka, kıvırma, kinaye, makta, medrese, müderris, mühre, müzehhip, nakkaş, nestalik, okka, rika, sipahi, telmih, tezhip, tımar,* is mostly based on the setting of the novel and is telling about his interest in reviving the Ottoman theme. Most of these words have been replaced with modern version and is rarely being used in contemporary Turkish today. In the Turkish version of *My Name is Red*, there are, at least, seventy six idiomatic expressions, about fifty assonant doublets and many other rhetorical devices that could be interpreted as how Pamuk delves into the richness of the Turkish language. Some of these rhetorical devices are being used considerably less in the contemporary Turkish language.

indicated the authors' twofold effort to illustrate a deliberate affinity to the early stages of modern Turkish, as a way to compliment the Ottoman past in their texts not only through their stories but also through their languages, which serve to their purpose of reminding us of the modern Turkish cultural connection to the Ottoman past.

While employing its different methodologies in this project, my research with the tools of digital humanities has introduced me to the depths and the difficulties of interdisciplinary collaboration particular to digital humanities and literary study due to the skeptics of both sides and the attitudes they often take on towards one another's disciplines. One such difficulty emerges in the definition and practice of close reading.

The observations I made in my modest text mining exercise are certainly attainable with a traditional close reading exercise; however, they are more feasible to perform with a digitally reinforced close reading – text mining – to apply one's interpretation based on the information gained from it. Text mining is not necessarily exclusive of engaging in (close) reading of the actual text, as some might associate this method with Franco Moretti's idea of distant reading.[11] It, in fact, takes its strength from a new form of a close reading, reinforced by the ability to detect textual patterns digitally, which might form a utopic blend of Moretti's distant reading with traditional literary close reading.[12]

---

[11] Franco Moretti introduces the idea of distance reading in his article "Conjectures on World Literature" (2000) and then develops it in his book *Distant Reading* (2013). The concept has received plenty of criticism, such as its being a misnomer to call it reading as it is a statistical processing and data mining. Proponents of the method argue for the scale distant reading techniques can analyze is not possible for humans to read and thus it provides a substantial difference in research.

[12] Although I have not digitally studied large-scale texts for this project, the digital examination of my corpus of primary literature, consisting of only four novels, has produced an interesting finding in

Use of close reading as the primary method of literary studies has recently been inflected by various ways. Today, close reading can be practiced rather unconventionally with the growing number of digital tools in addition to the traditional method confined to the text. Text mining, text mapping, and visualization tools, among others, function as different ways of close reading, not reducing literature to statistical numbers and data as some critics argue. Contrary to the belief of some literary critics,[13] who belittle those innovative tools that are being introduced as the methods of the twenty-first century, such new methods do not indicate a displacement of the text from the center of literary studies. On the contrary, they offer easier access to a much larger corpus of text that could be analyzed in a considerably shorter amount of time, a considerable contribution to the exploration of knowledge that traditional methods would often not be able to provide. This issue becomes even more relevant when I have considered what constitutes the corpuses of world literature and why.

Informed by dynamics between conventional and non-traditional methods of conducting literary research and analysis, such as close reading, I have chosen to take on an approach that has allowed me to capitalize on the strengths of both sides of the argument in my project. Thus, I have been able to incorporate the practice of traditional close reading, with the individual novels that I study and text mining and mapping tools

---

Tanpınar's deliberate word choices. This showed his connection to the Ottoman culture as well as allowed me to trace and interpret the simplification of his language for the late twentieth-century Turkish readers. This historically coincides with Pamuk's distinctive semantics illustrating a contemporary attempt to remind us how significantly Turkish language has changed throughout the century and how this change shows the politics of language when considered within the context of Ottoman and modern Turkish cultural relationship.

[13] See Love (2010). She argues that new methods displace the literary text and creates a superficial reading.

that allow detecting large scale patterns and embracing quantitative analysis, such as word choices and geographical references within both the actual novels I investigate and their cultural contexts. As a humanities scholar who is trained both in traditional methods and well informed by the methods of digital humanities, I value a combined use of these effective methods of doing literary research and analysis while refraining from debates that claim them mutually exclusive. Thus, I interpret the collaboration between interdisciplinary methods as conducive, intellectual conversations. I am acutely aware that all literary subjects cannot be easily quantified, neither should they be. However, I see great value in being knowledgeable of new methods in literary analysis and visualizing such *data* with text analysis and data visualization tools to inform close reading and enrich literary analyses. These tools can productively shape research and enhance humanistic inquiries.

As a scholarly investigation of current literary discussions on Turkish and Ottoman, this study parallels what the works I examine do in the transnational literary domain. Their reinterpretation of the Ottoman past is consistent with the necessity of the Empire's reconfiguration in global academic and scholarly provinces. The discursive conversation that the study engages in between the works themselves and their historical and disciplinary ramifications take shape through the embedded literary and disciplinary analysis I employ and the transnational conversation I enter.

The Narrative Path

The progression of this project goes from a brief discussion of comparative and world literature from the perspective of Turkey and a contextual analysis of the Turkish novel to Tanpınar's ambivalence about it and its representation and interpretation of such a modernity to Pamuk's Ottoman theme and discuss the status of Turkey in world literature. Taking the novel as the primary genre through which I explore the Ottoman theme and its implications for the Turkish presence in world literature, I argue in my third chapter that a contextual analysis of late nineteenth through twentieth-century Turkish novel is not only guiding but also indispensable for the purpose of this study. This historical literature review informs the basis of my comparative interpretation of the status of contemporary Turkish literature in the world literature.

My approach proceeds from the notion that cultures and literatures can be understood most clearly when one has an adequate knowledge of their literary and cultural histories as well as the ways in which different cultures view a particular culture. Such an informed approach proves particularly beneficial when studying contemporary Turkish literature. In addition to having a historical knowledge of the Ottoman past, I argue that a close examination of what role the Empire played in the world and how it has been represented in literary works as well as in historical accounts prove to be critical. This historically informed approach produces a qualified scholarly analysis of contemporary Turkish literature. As I incorporate this historical perspective into my literary analysis, I show how this type of analysis resists an inductive Occidentalism in reading Turkish literature. The research, in the third chapter, recognizes and questions the

implications, literary traditions, representations, and stereotypes about the Ottoman Empire that might be indistinguishable otherwise.

The contextual analysis I provide in the Chapter 3 lays the necessary foundation for my first case study on Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's novels in the next Chapter. Comparatively, it helps trace some of the impetus that feeds Pamuk's novels that I analyze. My analysis on Tanpınar serves as a preface to the struggles that the early twentieth-century nationalist Turkish authors had with the Ottoman literary past and how authors like Tanpınar challenged the reasons for such struggles. The critical acclaim of Tanpınar's works, *A Mind at Peace* and *The Time Regulation Institute*, both precedes and follows Pamuk's global fame and thus, informs and guides the reading of the latter.

The analysis of *A Mind at Peace* and *The Time Regulation Institute* in this chapter preludes the following chapter in which I situate Pamuk's novels in a historical and literary investigation of the Ottoman past. Readers will see noticeable similarities between Pamuk and Tanpınar regarding theme and style; however, their works also illustrate distinctive divergences between the two authors in the ways in which they interpret the Ottoman past. Tanpınar's novels epitomize the diversity of Turkish views of the Ottoman past, one, which defies a homogenous account. While Pamuk is considerably more straightforward about the imperfections and positive attributions of the culture of the past, Tanpınar tends to be milder in his criticism of the past. He presents a noticeable appreciation and longing for the culture that was disappearing during the 1940s because of the ardent nationalism and modernization attempts that took place in every aspect of the society. His efforts to create a "synthesis" between the past and the

present translate into a bold encounter with the past as part of the present in Pamuk's narratives. The two authors' different points in time of history might have initiated their divergences, but this becomes relatively less influential in my consideration of their representation of Turkey in world literature today.

While Tanpınar had to hypothesize about the consequences of Turkish nationalism and modernism no matter how predictable they could have been for him, Pamuk has the actual knowledge and experience of those consequences. This historical position gives Pamuk a significant privilege to reflect back on the Ottoman past and Turkish modernism, as someone who has seen the consequences that Tanpınar did not live to see. These two authors' reflections on the Ottoman past allow the reader to see the nuanced and heterogeneous nature of Turkish literature and intelligentsia, which disqualifies it from standard accounts of a singular, nationalist, and homogenous description as a nation. Thus, a cosmopolitan and contradicting accounts of the Ottoman past by Turkish authors invite global readers to revisit their notions of Turkey and Turkish literature while also offering new ways of interpreting world literature from a perspective that is not based solely on a single representative of a nation within its sphere. The rediscovery of Tanpınar in the late 1990s and recent translations of his works reinforce the emerging presence of Turkish literature in the global setting.

I offer a parallel account of Orhan Pamuk in my fourth chapter. Subsequent to Tanpınar, but preceding him in translation and fame, Pamuk's *My Name is Red* and *The White Castle* demonstrate the point the Ottoman theme has reached in contemporary Turkish literature. I scrutinize how re-expressions of Ottoman history function in *The*

White Castle and *My Name is Red*. I do a close reading of the novels, which explicitly invoke the Ottoman past, to detect and interpret the author's way of conveying the Ottoman theme to the global reader. This kind of reading also allows me to compare how such conveyance operates both in Turkish and in English. By means of their "afterlife" in translation, as Walter Benjamin would argue, the novels allow the reader of world literature to read the Ottoman Empire from the author's critical perspective, which significantly differs from existing notions about the Ottoman Empire that choose not to acknowledge its cultural importance as well as from accounts that glorify the Empire uncritically. Thus, I expose how the author challenges existing notions and accounts while providing a culturally informed as well as a more intriguing reading of the Ottoman past for both global and local readers in both languages.

My analysis of Orhan Pamuk's novels has a rationale that is not primarily attentive to the author's canonicity in Turkish and world literature as much as it is to his exceptional rework of the Ottoman theme. Pamuk is significant for reasons in addition to his being the Nobel Prize Laureate for literature, and being relatively reputable in world literature. Pamuk is a compelling example of an author and reader making use of a cultural history, blending it with the modern and presenting it to the world of literature. Pamuk's indebtedness to Ottoman culture and history is indisputable as much as his dependence on Western literature is; his case provides an intriguing one for the presence of national history within world literature. The chapter on Pamuk ends with contextualizing the approach that there can be no pure national literature, just as there

cannot be a world literature without a consideration of individualities of national literatures and their histories.

I place these authors and Turkish literature as a whole in dialog with the broader debates on world literature and inform the global conversation through the assessment of this distinctive and local cosmopolitanism. My goal is not to give separate analyses of Tanpınar and Pamuk but to schematize their influence on interpreting and shaping modern Turkish literature, particularly for the global reader. What comes out of this comparison illustrates the reasons behind particular historical actualities that made each of these authors represent a cosmopolitan Turkey to the world. Understandably, these authors fail to do justice to modern Turkish literature and particularly to representing its face in world literature. Moreover, a comparative investigation cannot limit itself to a few authors, a single discipline or national borders. Thus, my comparative analysis of these two authors proves indispensable to examine the considerable emergence of Turkey in the world literary space but it also presents how such existence is reinforced by the cultural history of the Ottoman Empire. I aim to encourage further research from a comparative and global perspective on modern Turkish literature, which would ideally enhance the practice of comparative literature in and about Turkey.

I analyze Pamuk's and Tanpınar's novels from a historical and cultural perspective that considers the Ottoman theme as a way of reading to transcend, not only local and Republican but also western and Eurocentric points of view. I suggest that these novels confidently attempt to inflect the debates over world literature and provide a nuanced and multidimensional approach to texts and their respective cultures. This

approach bases the success of texts circulated into world literature not only on their ability to maintain an "afterlife" upon translation, as Walter Benjamin defines in "The Task of the Translator," but their ability to challenge as well as transform standard global perspectives on their individual cultures.

Centuries-old prejudices can be dissipated through translation. However, it might also reinforce those prejudices depending on particularities of translation itself. I provide a succinct overview of the development of translation and world literature in the West and Turkey while also examining its influence on contemporary Turkish literature and its transition to world literature. I situate modern Turkish literature as a non-Western canon within world literature. Emphasizing the plurality of "world literature*s*," within this context, I position Pamuk and Tanpınar in the world literary space and invite a new way of thinking about comparative cosmopolitanisms as emerging from local grounds.

From this perspective, I further Damrosch's idea in *What is World Literature?* that argues that works of world literature transcends their original culture and gain a different identity in the new "system." I employ his idea in that in the case of Turkey, a different identity occurs; however, it does not necessarily strip Turkey of its cultural identity to gain a global one, which is deemed necessary to be considered *world literature*, but, in fact, reclaims its Ottoman cultural identity and this occurrence primarily validates Turkish presence in world literature. I conclude my argument by projecting the case of Turkey from local to global and commenting on the role of translation in this process.

The works of these authors and the contemporary Turkish literature participate in the broader debates the nature and implications of the very category of "world literature." My study sketches the implications of a non-Western imperial and post-imperial literary canon, such as Turkish literature, securing its place among the great world literary traditions. For Pamuk and Tanpınar, being a global writer not only participates in our contemporary revival of cosmopolitanism, but it also contributes a locally diverse and already worldly culture idiom to that revival. Beyond the comparisons I undertake here, my broad purpose of this study is to encourage a more informed understanding of modern Turkish literature and its emergence on the world literary stage. Finally, I reinforce the idea that Turkey distinctively informs the global conversation on world literature through its distinctive and local cosmopolitanism.

Chapter 1

Reinterpreting the Ottoman Empire: A Method for Critical History

During the last two decades, there has been a considerable attempt to re-evaluate the Ottoman cultural and historical past and its effects on contemporary Turkish culture and literature.[14] It requires a close analysis to reveal the potential outcomes of this moment for the future of Turkish literature in the world. The increasing number of publications on the Ottoman Empire, mainly in history and literature, is a result of a cultural identity problem that Turkey dealt with throughout the twentieth-century. Many would argue that the country is still experiencing the same problem and the recent incline toward the imperial past is a ramification of it.

Although there are studies about the Ottoman Empire and its relation to modern Turkey published during the second half of the twentieth-century,[15] the demand for such studies had never been as high as it has been during the early twenty-first century. Furthermore, the number of historical novels and accounts published in Turkey had been small and was vastly overshadowed by those from the United States and England, such as

[14] See Quataert (2005), İnalcık (2006), Hanioğlu (2008), Philliou (2011), and Bryce (2013).
[15] See Finn (1984) and Lewis (1961).

those written by Goffman (2002), Greene (2005), Newton (2007), Maclean (2007), and Kugler (2012). Why is there now a significant increase in the interest in Ottoman history around the world? How does this reconsideration of the Ottoman is different from earlier accounts and how do those, who have recently written on the Ottoman Empire, signal a recovered awareness that the Ottomans were, in fact, critical to European history?

The increase in the number of publications on the Ottoman Empire in Turkey is considerable, such as İnalcık (1973; 1993; 2000), Ortaylı (2006), Freely (2011), Halman (2006; 2007), Karpat (2002). They offer a comprehensive and relatively more objective understanding of the Ottoman Empire. Similarly, historical novels, focusing on the Ottoman past create a corpus of quasi-historical writing that challenges but, at times, also reinforces the Anglo-American texts and their understanding of the Empire. For instance, Ortaylı's *Osmanlıyı Yeniden Keşfetmek* (2006) [Re-Discovering the Ottoman] offers new perspectives on seemingly simple, but fundamentally intriguing questions, such as "What is the Ottoman Empire?" or "What is its meaning to us [Turks] today?" The increase in historical studies is seen in literary works as well.

Turkish literary critics have not sufficiently valorized this phenomenon as a new age about the Ottomans in contemporary Turkish culture and literature. While providing valuable research on Ottoman culture and modern Turkish literature during the twentieth-century, Turkish literary critics, such as Berna Moran (1983), Jale Parla (1990), Murat Belge (2008), and Kader Konuk (2010) tend to evaluate the history and literature of Turkey more locally rather than in a conversation with the world. Their works nonetheless have formed the basis for more comparative work between Turkey and the

West. Scholars from Europe and particularly from England have also recently widely published on the issues regarding Turkey (Maclean, Goffman).

In this project, I question the implications of this recent interest in the Ottoman Empire and its impact on current Turkish literature. I argue that in the recent rise of world literature, history plays an indispensable role, as the works of Pamuk and Tanpınar manifest. That is, literary writers and historians have gotten ahead of the literary critics. I hope to show in the study that Turkish authors do have a greater awareness of this large comparative project. Most particularly, I argue that they are aware of what has come to be called world literature debates. To make this case is not easy: current scholarly debates on world literature in the United States are constantly changing. Nevertheless, the main argument about world literature favors defining world literature as works from around the world that can maintain their existence after they travel transnationally. My analysis of the Turkish novels in this study aims to focus on the particular features of such existence for Turkish literature by offering the Ottoman theme as an indispensable part of it.

Comparative and World Literature in the Turkish Context

Globalization has shifted the parameters of world literature and comparative literature as the disciplinary methodologies of these fields have appropriated to the analysis of emerging patterns of global change. Comparative literature's disciplinary dependence upon the nation as a unit of comparison seems to be altered or even challenged by the processes of globalization that tend to detach cultural formations from

national territories. Terms like "post-national," "post-geographical," and "glocal" are being used to define a new literary space where these two disciplines now operate.

In recent forms of the debate, the concept of world literature is often "blurred" (Thomsen 2010), and so current academic debates are trying to resolve the ambiguity the term has. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe used the concept of *Weltliteratur*[16] as the international circulation of literary works with a focus on European literature. In 1848, Marx and Engels strengthened Goethe's definition of the term stating, "National one-sidedness and narrowness will become increasingly impossible and from the many national and regional literatures, a world literature will emerge" (*Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei* 446). Both of these approaches presented the concept of literature as a planetary system and indicated a symbolic end for national literature. Reinforcing similar aspects of the term, other scholars have recently reinterpreted it as "an intellectual challenge to national literatures" (Moretti 2000).

For David Damrosch (2003), however, world literature has become a category of literary production, publication, and circulation. For some scholars and their studies, such as Pascale Casanova in *The World Republic of Letters* (2004) and Franco Moretti in "Conjectures of World Literature" (2000), the term does not mean only a collection of great works of different national literatures; in other words, it is not only an expanded canon. None of these attempts per se seems sufficient to articulate how that term might still be applicable today and how a national literature like Turkish can claim space in it.

[16] See Goethe and Eckermann (1971)

The recent rise of the discussion on world literature in the United States is primarily attributed to David Damrosch, who with his books *What is World Literature?* (2003)*, Teaching World Literature* (2009), and *How to Read World Literature* (2009), both contribute to a corpus of scholarly works and inflame discussions on the distinctions and implications underlying the conceptualization of world literature, such as the argument Emily Apter presents in *Against World Literature*: *On the Politics of Untranslatability* (2013).

Following Goethe's line of thought, Damrosch expands the interpretation of the term and favors the close reading of individual works, which challenges Moretti's idea of "distant reading" (Moretti 2000) that considers broad scale patterns. Standing out among other scholars, Damrosch has challenged the term's established definition as the canon of European masterpieces by contesting the primarily Eurocentric and masterpiece focused nature it has attributed to literature and instead promotes the idea of translation. Scholarly debates on the canon have resulted in a considerable expansion of canons. This can be observed in recently published world literature anthologies, such as Longman, Bedford, and Norton, which explicitly reach beyond the European world of literature. However, an expanded canon is yet to answer all the questions revolving around the validity of the claim for the term world literature to represent the whole world. Nations, scholars' literary values, readers (local or global) that writers target, as well as translators' individual choices determine what we end up naming world literature today. Thus, not only translation, politics, and marketing but also the disciplinary approaches of

scholars and writers with various cultural and national backgrounds and specializations shape the understanding of world literature.

The cases I follow here suggest an additional aspect. Scholars, authors, and readers play a primary role in the constant reformulation and variability of the discipline of world literature according to what they acknowledge as literature as well as how their specialized knowledge conditions their perceptions. Thus, the landscape of world literature constantly gets redrawn according to the national and cultural predispositions of the individual. Considering these factors, one can strongly challenge the argument, which some critics and authors of world literature favor (Damrosch, Pamuk[17]) that the high quality of a literary work is the greatest determinant of its status in world literature can be contested. This project is informed by the critics of world literature and evaluates the application and understanding of their theories on Turkish literature, a contributor to world literature. The issue is, after all, at the basis of modern Turkish intellectual life, even if its literary scholars have not fully engaged with it yet.

Nowadays, the source culture is also implicated, as the field of literary studies is experiencing a crucial moment. At this moment, national literatures and individual authors question, revise, and compete with others to form an image that would foster their global existence as part of an extended post-national dialog. The debates on world literature in the United States affect the Turkish literary world in a particular way. Although the revised interest in the Ottoman world that I mentioned above cannot be

[17] During the summer of 2012, The Institute of World Literature, founded and directed by David Damrosch, met in Istanbul and held a talk by Orhan Pamuk where both Pamuk and Damrosch clearly supported the argument.

interpreted as an attempt solely to gain prestige on the world stage, the theme of the Ottoman attracts attention from global literary circles, which allow Turkey to engage in a different kind of "world literature" dialog – a meeting, rather than a mere imposition.

Comparative literature has an absent presence in Turkey, being ironic to its presumably Turkish origin. Leo Spitzer and Erich Auerbach who established Romance Languages Department at Istanbul University and published literary journals at a time when nationalist Turkish literature would not have welcomed what comparative literature offered, namely a world focus and cosmopolitanism. Today, just like the discipline's institutional representation, the critical comparative study is still an absent-presence in Turkey. There are currently a hundred and ninety-six universities in Turkey. Only seven of these schools have departments of comparative literature and only three of these seven departments offer graduate degrees.

The discipline did not legitimately flourish in Turkey, its so-called birthplace, for various reasons. Establishment of a comparative literary legacy did not occur because of the Eurocentric approach of European pioneers of the field as exiles in Turkey and because of a radical denial of the Ottoman past. A traumatic encounter with Europe as a model for modernization as well as the ardent nationalism that ruled the country during most of the twentieth-century are among the factors that contributed to the underdevelopment of the discipline in Turkey. Was Turkey only a purely nationalist culture that had no room for any comparative approach to culture and literature?

My dissertation negates a positive answer to the above question by positioning the relatively absent nature of the discipline and its practice in Turkish literature as an

outcome of political atmosphere during the discipline's preliminary formulation, and not as a lack of cultural content necessary for comparative work. By so doing, it suggests that this lack is another reason why the recent emergence of Turkish literary works in the world comparative context through the Ottoman past constitutes a significant response to the questionable legacy of the exilic scholars, Spitzer, and Auerbach. Similarly, it argues that Republican erasure of the Ottoman past, substantially discouraging the possibility of possible development of comparative study in Turkish literature by uprooting its literary history, was as Eurocentric as the kind of modernism that it employed.

The exploration of comparative analysis in the context of Ottoman-Turkish and modern Turkish is facilitated through the theme of the Ottoman past in the novels I analyze. These works' translation into the space of world literature coincides with Turkish self-exploration and global representation, at the same time, encouraging a reassessment of existing notions on the Ottoman and modern Turkish cultural contexts.

The issue of national identity is being surpassed by the revival of the Ottoman theme in contemporary Turkish literature. Besides, the emergence of Turkey on the world literary stage with a considerable emphasis on the Ottoman theme shows how cultures and literatures are rooted in their histories.

Historicizing the centuries-long European conceptualization of the term "Turk" and its present implications in world literary realm is valuable to evaluate how a set of cultural stereotypes[18] can function in this process of translation as national authors

[18] For centuries, Turkey has been associated with various images in close connection with the historical events that took place within and outside the Ottoman Empire. With the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the predominant images of the Turk in Europe, generated with a sub-theme of fear, included "scourge

attempt to reshape literary perceptions of Turkey around the world against these prevailing stereotypes. At interpretation, I make the genealogy of stereotypes interpret, for example, how early Republican Turkey was informed by the ideas of the Ottoman and reflected them upon the collapsed Empire to help differentiate the new Turk. As noted above, the novels I analyze, in turn, are consciously repurposing these images, either in Turkish or in translation.

Debates on world literature and translation constitute a major theoretical yield of this project. The interpretation of translation within the realm of world literature shapes and alters the conceptualization of literary translation as a tool providing access to transnational cultures. In traditional models of the global literature, translation functions in a reverse way than it did for Turkey: translation is not seen as impacting the source culture. I argue that, in Turkey, translations are shaped, to a considerable degree, by literary traditions and by an active awareness of what works would be translated. In this way, contemporary Turkish authors are engaging with the stage of world literature and its market to intervene in this particular network of global culture. With this, debates about world literature are expanded by the consideration of translation networks and how they work in a Turkish literary context.

---

of God," "infidel," "barbarian," "ruthless monarch" "licentious" in addition to these the Turk was often associated with vice, violence, plunder. While the conquest of Constantinople secured a negative but mighty name fort he Turk and resulted in multiplication of that image in Europe in its aftermath, in 1683, Turks were defeated in their expedition against the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I and this event marked the beginning of the empire's decline. With this defeat, the Ottomans ceased to be a threat to the Christian World. The Turks no longer terrified the Christians and the image of the Turk dropped its association with a source of fear and was left only with the negativity of it. For a detailed analysis of the image of the Turk in Europe, see Çırakman (2002).

At this point, my theoretical point ends up further complicating the debates over world literature by explicitly accounting for history in both the source and target cultures. It necessarily implicates our thinking about the world as a unit of meaning and agency in the world and literature.

National histories reflect upon literature while the debates over world literature seem to overlook this influence. However, the Turkish case suggests that history and world literature cannot be separated. A work of literature comes with a history attached to it; it is not an arbitrary or prescripted assemblage of stereotypes. Orhan Pamuk and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar illustrate this point well as they take up Ottoman culture and history and reveal how local history can play a significant role when representing a culture to the world. The details of how the centuries-long Ottoman past translated into cultural identity problem during the twentieth-century Turkish culture and literature are essential to my interpretation of Turkey, its history, and its status in the world.

This project thus distinguishes itself from its predecessors by being comparative in nature. I see it critical to study contemporary Turkish literature in relation to the contexts of world literature and Ottoman history. It allows identifying its specific goals in impacting contemporary literature and the image of Turkey on the global stage. For this reason, my project aims to be a significant contribution to the study of comparative and world literature in the context of cultural contact, especially in these moments where political dependencies should not be equated with cultural ones.

Beyond the specific comparisons I undertake here, my broad purpose is to encourage a more informed understanding of contemporary Turkish literature and its

emergence on the world literary stage. Positioning the Ottoman-Turkish society as a fundamental component of the world history argues it not as a victim of a westernizing world literature, but rather as a sophisticated transaction between national cultures and global ones.

Translation of Turkish Literature into World Literature

When Goethe's idea of world literature started discussions on what world literature might be in the first half of the nineteenth-century, nationalism had already been on the rise. Nation-building projects extensively utilized literature to strengthen the sense of national identities; this was also true for Turkey. Eventually, nations became more cautious about their literary representations in the world. and most of these representations take place through translation. Thus, when considering Turkey's emergence in world literature, the role of translation theories is useful to compare to the history of (literary) translation in Turkey.

Standard Western scholarship on translation informs the debates over world literature. André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett in *Translation, Culture, and History* (1990) consider translation as "rewriting" of an original text. With translation, "rewritings" of cultures are also produced within the context of comparative and world literature. The ability to shape one culture by means of another gives translation a significant power, which becomes even more significant on a global literary stage. Lefevere and Bassnett argue, "The map-maker, the translator, and the travel writer are not innocent producers of text. The works they create are part of a process of manipulation

that shapes and conditions our attitudes to other cultures while purporting to be something else" (99). In *Translation Zone* (2006), Emily Apter underscores the idea of translation as a way to denationalize literature. According to David Damrosch, "A work only has an effective life as world literature whenever, and wherever, it is actively present within a literary system beyond that of its original culture" (*What is World Literature?* 4).

The idea that a translated work, which transcends its original culture and gains a different identity in the new "system," is also seen in Walter Benjamin's seminal essay "The Task of the Translator" where he talks about the "afterlife" of a text upon its translation. Damrosch claims that works that gain in translation consist world literature. This idea informs Damrosch's discussion on world literature as "an elliptical refraction of national literatures" (*What is World Literature?* 281). The idea of an *elliptical* movement, taking place between the source culture and the culture where the translated work of literature circulates, also suggests that a literary work never leaves its place of origin, but simply has a connection to the both in the country where it travels and the one where it originates. This way it exists in both cultures. The close connection between translation and world literature brings the question of how translation is perceived in different cultures.

In *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability* (2013), Apter rejects the idea that everything is translatable and argues that through untranslatability a better cross-cultural engagement can be reached. In her argument, she defies world literature's claim to facilitate such engagement and explains that world literature tends to

be proprietorial, ignorant of linguistic specificity while also appropriating world cultural products as digestible commodities. In *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon* (2014) she co-edited, Apter furthers her claim to untranslatability through a dictionary of what she claims to be "untranslatables." Such debates invite scholars to think the translation in different ways in which world literature as a discipline defined and globalized literary products of individual nations can be interpreted.

In Turkey, the meanings and implications of translation policies contribute to a fuller depiction of a socio-cultural context. Considering the Turkish mindset about translation and translation's contemporary role in world literature requires a close analysis of the history of Turkish literary translation and how such history influences the Turkish case today. This brief historiography contributes to the thematic analysis of the case studies in this project by allowing a relatively more technical analysis of current Turkish literary presence in the world with a consideration of literary translation and its influence.

The Ottoman state widely used translation mainly for political reasons. In the nineteenth-century, there was a strong interrelation between translation in Turkey and the country's westernization attempts. The first translation chamber (*Terceme Odası*) was established in the early nineteenth-century during the reign of Mahmud II (1789 – 1839). The Translation Bureau, set up in 1939, was dedicated to translating Western classics into Turkish. Although it is still very limited, translation of literary works from Turkish into other languages has considerably increased since the second half of the twentieth-century, when Turkish authors mainly produced more works in originally Western genres, such as

the novel. Among the works in the early twentieth-century Turkish literature, very few are translated and even fewer of them achieved more than mediocre success in the Western literary world. Today, however, translated Turkish novels primarily shape the reception of contemporary Turkish literature in the rest of the world as being the leading literary genre that is being translated from Turkish into other languages. With the revived interest in the theorization of world literature and consequently in the practice of translation, Turkish literature stands in this relatively new phenomenon more apparent than ever due to recent translations of authors like Pamuk and Tanpınar from prominent publication houses.

Through the discussion of literary translation, world literature debates become more relevant to this project. I consider the fluctuations in debates over world literature critical for understanding how Turkish presence in world literature today not only benefits from this discipline while reshaping its transnational representation but it also benefits various understandings of world literature. Before the internationally recognized Ottoman novels of Orhan Pamuk, standard accounts and scholarship on the Ottoman Empire had an understanding and representation of the Ottoman Empire, which was considerably different from the picture that Pamuk's novels are drawing.

The Ottoman Empire was not recognized among the major empires in history. This, however, has recently been changing. With the recent increase in studies in world literature theory, a more expansive and inclusive view of the world has begun to be explored. New perspectives of scholars and authors around the world challenge standard ideas about different cultures and their histories as the number of translated works

increases. Thus, world literature becomes critical for Turkish literature to reclaim its Ottoman past from the repercussions of both local and global politics and allows seeing the Empire from a more objective and critical perspective. Pamuk's novels suggest such critical readings of the Empire while also bringing out the modern Turkish identity as an inseparable part of it. Thus, it suggests a crucial relation between a global representation of a culture and its national history. In the Turkish case, such a relation allows a reformation of the local understanding of Turkish identity by bringing in the significant Ottoman component that has been neglected for the most part in modern history.

Over the course of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Turkey aspired to modernize and considered Europe an ideal model. Modernization and westernization were concepts almost equaling to a sense of 'Europeanization.' Endless attempts to become a member of the European Union for more than five decades now can be interpreted as just another ramification of this long aspiration. Although Turkey's demand for European Union membership continues, the last two decades particularly manifest an inclining toward the United States rather than Europe. This approach to the United States coincides with the rise of the discourse on world literature in the United States' academia, which certainly influences how Turkish understanding of world literature is being shaped. Moreover, Turkey's only Nobel Prize laureate in literature, who lives in the United States, and his books getting published in English even before they do so in Turkish receive a curious attention from the Turkish literary circles about the impact of world literary trends on contemporary Turkish literature.

The ongoing debates on world literature generate profound implications for national literatures. World literature creates the urge to reframe the scholarly understanding of national literatures as texts from individual national literatures redefine their cultures of origin in the world space. Thus, the debates over world literature have also recently gained momentum in Turkish literary circles. Pamuk's winning the Nobel Prize in 2006, Tanpınar's recent translation published by Penguin classics and the increase in the number of contemporary Turkish authors, whose works have been translated primarily into European languages, undoubtedly contributed to the curiosity and excitement about world literature as a literary space where alternative ideas could be voiced.

Although many parts of the world have recently begun engaging their literatures in the world, the defining theories and discussions take place primarily in the United States academia. In fact, the echoes of theories debated in the United States are heard all over the world creating debates about the plurality of world literature. In such a picture, Turkish literature in relation to the United States and the implications of this cultural, political and literary relation needs further consideration. The literary hegemony of the United States over theoretical debates on world literature requires a critical examination of the scholarly discussions in the country and its ramifications in literary circles around the world.

The understanding of translation, comparative and world literature in Turkey is closely connected to the steps it took to westernize. During the 1930s, Turkey was a popular place to immigrate for European scholars. While the scholars came to Turkey for

their own benefit, Turkey wanted them to "support country's modernization reforms" (Konuk, 4). "[European scholars'] escape from Europe catalyzed the Turkish Renaissance in the twentieth-century: European scholars would revive classical education in the city once hailed as the greatest center of learning in the world" (Konuk, 2). Leo Spitzer, one of the first people who enhanced the study of comparative literature in the United States, lived in Turkey between 1933 and 1936 as the first professor of Romance languages and literature and the director of the School of Foreign Languages at Istanbul University. He was followed by Eric Auerbach, who was another scholar in Turkish exile running from anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany. It is hard to say how much of the assumption that the minister of republican Turkey had about these scholars' role in "Turkish Renaissance" realized considering the immature state of comparative literature studies in Turkey today. Their influence on the Turkish "modernization project" and what their exile in Turkey mean for the Turkish literature in comparison to how they contributed to the study of translation, comparative and world literature in the United States shows striking differences.

The lack of an established tradition of comparative literature in Turkey although it presumably has a Turkish origin through the European exilic scholars is an issue that might become important when thinking about Turkey's understanding and practice of world literature. Contemporary Turkish authors and literary critics have begun to change this absence through a conversation with Turkey's cosmopolitan Ottoman past. By doing so, Turkish authors claim a place in world literature as if to reverse not only the influence of Turkish nationalism during the 1930s and 1940s but also the indifference of the

European scholars to the local culture during their exile. Such a history of absent presence of comparative studies, as well as cosmopolitan culture in modern Turkey, comes into play in Turkey's claim for space in world literature and redefinition of its cultural image in the world literary space. This has been made possible through a reconsideration and critical representation of the Ottoman past in literature that is circulating the world in an "elliptical" motion.

Chapter 2

Contextualization of Twentieth-Century Turkish Novel

Considering the cultural and literary space of Ottoman-Turkish literature when the novel was first introduced is elucidative for any study of the novel in Turkish. When the novel was introduced to the compilation of Ottoman literature through translations in the second half of the nineteenth-century, Ottoman literature had a long tradition of poetry. The practice of prose, although extant, was not popular. The novel offered a different literary space for the centuries-long literary tradition to manifest itself rather than creating the practice of novelization out of nothing. This manifestation, however, was often misinterpreted. In other words, the novel brought a space where the cultural content could reach a broader audience. It belies the parochial approach that views the genre simply as an import. Its practical application in nineteenth-century Ottoman society, as well as in the early twentieth-century Turkey, tended to view the genre as a mere imitation of the Western novel.

The emergence of the novel originated during the Tanzimat reforms of the second half of the nineteenth-century. The intellectual milieu of the time indicates that the genre and its function within the Ottoman society need to be explained in terms that consider it

more than a literary import. The novel was just another medium, which utilized more efficient means for the Ottoman society than other literary forms that existed at the time. An emerging intelligentsia spearheaded by members of the reformist Young Ottomans was forming in the Empire when they turned their gaze to the novel. They were in search of alternative modes for channeling their thoughts. The reformists disseminated their ideas to the public through a newly founded print media, namely, newspapers. It was the members of this new intelligentsia, such as Namık Kemal and Şinasi, who were widely exposed to French literature, that translated and wrote the first novels. As Turkish literary scholar Ahmet Ö. Evin argued in *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*, "they looked upon Europe with a mixture of sympathetic curiosity and defensive vigilance as Ottoman reformers of several preceding generations had done" (10-11). In this period of social reforms, new genres were introduced thus considerably transformed the existing ones.

One primary characteristic of the reformist Young Ottoman intellectuals, like Namık Kemal, was their obsession with using literature as a didactic tool in which they disseminate their ideas. For Kemal, "the great utility of discourse … is its service in the proper education of a nation" (qt. in Evin 11). Their literary productions served to convey their ideas about the nation and its reformation. This constituted the initial attempts to utilize literature as a medium in which one could convey political ideas through new genres that emerged and transformed traditional ones. The Young Ottoman position that viewed literature as a functional practice, and which took content over rhetoric, did so by undermining the aesthetic values of the poetic tradition. It was entirely disparate from the

classical literature (poetry) of previous generations, which aimed to excel "verbal embellishment" (Evin 12) – that later created a language duality between the language spoken by the elite and among ordinary citizenry –. Poetry did not have any utilitarian value, according to the Young Ottoman thinkers. According to them, it was detached from social reality and ostensibly devoid of meaning. New genres became applicable during this struggle. The first Turkish play, *Şair Evlenmesi* (1859), marked the official beginning of theater. However, even before this first play, theaters existed in Istanbul in the nineteenth-century.

In the "Introduction" to his play *Celâlettin Harzemşah* (1875), which is, in fact, one of his critical articles, Namık Kemal argued that the theater is the best genre to show the power of expression; thus, it is a genre that had to be used in the Ottoman literature (qt. in Evin 340 – 343). It was this time that fostered an atmosphere of absolute obsession for progress, which united all intellectuals holding differing ideologies when the novel attracted their attention and established and appropriated the genre within three decades.

The challenge to counter traditional literature through the novel was a substantial one that these intellectuals and their successors struggled with for decades. As seen at the start of the twentieth-century, the attitude of the Young Ottomans toward traditional literature proved to be the beginning of a more blatant rejection of the Ottoman past by the prominent figures of the Turkish Republic. However, during the nineteenth-century, the situation was much more complicated than the standard argument about the 'rejection of the past,' which tends to dominate the contemporary narrative. Turkish intellectuals of

the nineteenth-century pined for the glory days of the Empire – an empire, which was in sharp decline.

The prominent members of the Young Ottomans aimed to revive the golden days of the Empire by utilizing literature because they had discovered something that their predecessors had not realized: Literature could provide substantial power by conveying ideologies to the public. This realization reveals a significant detail about the novel in its initial stages in Turkey. The novel was a practical tool and not as a literary invention imported from the West that cures literary insufficiencies in Ottoman literature. With an increasing focus on utilizing literature and an equally fading emphasis on the perfection of style, the adoption of the novel was for practical motivations more so than any other reason. The reformists believed that existing genres of literature did not satisfactorily serve their primary goal, which was to allow their ideas to be heard, as well as accepted by a wider audience, and the novel successfully served this purpose. Evin argues, "the enormous possibilities that the novel afforded as a didactic medium were most appealing to the idealism of the post-Tanzimat generation of idealists;" they would "employ fiction chiefly to espouse social and political ideas" (18). This attitude completely transformed how the Ottomans understood literature. However, this transformation was not located in how they saw the novel.

Reformist intellectuals, such as Kemal, emphasized the difference between traditional Turkish narrative genres and the European novel praising the latter based on its use of realism. He argued that traditional Turkish stories were "based on subjects that lie altogether outside the realm of nature and reality" (qt. in Evin 19). Consequently,

realism became "the standard against which rose fiction would be judged" in the last decades of the nineteenth-century (19-20). Thus, from the very beginning, the genre was structured in a way, which disregarded traditions and their influence. This negligence oriented the development of the Turkish novel away from existing narrative forms with varying narrative genres, such as folk literature. In spite of this, early Turkish novelists could not undo the influence of traditional narrative entirely. Although the number of analytic studies, which focused on the influence of the traditional narrative forms on the early Turkish novels, falls short, the folkloric elements of narrative genres lingered in the early novels. Such elements, according to Evin, influenced the style, tone, and authorial attitude in the first novels (23). These elements constitute a significant feature of Pamuk's novels, suggesting Pamuk's consideration of the history of the Turkish novel.

As in *The White Castle*, *My Name is Red* has storytellers that narrate the story in the form of animals and objects. *Meddah* stories often included "humorous anecdotes about human foibles, … mockery of social mores" (*Rapture and Revolution* 110) and satire gradually became central to their storytelling. This kind of "parodic narration" is also present in *My Name is Red* in the figure of the *meddah*. "Pamuk identifies the character of the *meddah* as a type of author of oral literature who is integral to narrative production, and the tradition of the modern Turkish novel " (*Orhan Pamuk* 141). Göknar rightly points out that The murder of the storyteller by cutting out his tongue so he cannot tell stories that insult the sacredness of Hoja Effendi in *My Name is Red* is suggestive for the erasure of the practice of *meddah*s after the novel (356). By including the storyteller into the novel, Pamuk oscillates between writing and storytelling, and the novel's before-

and-after theme by disregarding the presence of time and novelizes the traditional practice of storytelling into the modern form of the novel. Hence, he allows the Ottoman tradition to gain a presence in front of the modern reader.

Different forms of narrative existed in Turkish literature before the novel. Ottoman literature did not consist solely of poetry before the assimilation of the novel in Turkey. Literature that existed before the novel was as heterodox as the Ottoman society itself. According to Turkish historian Mustafa Nihat Özön, these forms could be examined under five categories: narrative in verse, in other words, Divan poetry; prose narratives of classical tradition, popular stories read by storytellers; oral stories, and stories that aimed moral teachings, such as fables (folk wisdom) (*Türkçe'de Roman* 32). Stories were inspired by tales of *A Thousand and One Nights*, and oral stories performed by professional storytellers, *meddah*s. Some of these stories were recorded and are the versions that "constituted a genre which comes closest to published fiction among all the forms of traditional Turkish narrative" (Evin 29). Evin discusses a compelling example of a recorded *meddah* story is *Hançerli Hanım Hikaye'i Garibesi* [The Extraordinary Story of the Lady with the Dagger], which was put in writing between 1851-2 in Istanbul. The story is about a wealthy woman who falls in love with a young man; however, the love is unrequited, and she thereby chooses another young man who is murdered by the lady. *Hançerli Hanım* is a discernible proof for the sophistication the *meddah* narrative had achieved in the nineteenth-century for two main reasons. Firstly, the storyteller claims "for authorship" by presenting himself among the characters in the story. He appears as a witness in the story and establishes "his authority over the text and claims the authenticity

of the story (34 – 35). It shows a divergence from the fantastic stories of the traditional tales and heralds a new type of fiction that concerns itself with the issues of its historical time and space.

Consisting of real types and locations from seventeenth-century Istanbul, *Hançerli Hanım* and other stories like it "constitute the only genre displaying a rudimentary form of realism in Ottoman literature" (35). This particular story is also a story within a story. The protagonist Hançerli Hanım, the Lady with the Dagger, asks the *meddah*, another character in the story, to make up a story to facilitate her plan to kill the young man. It shows that the storytellers had used some of the literary techniques that are mainly attributed to the genre of the novel later. It is also discernible that both literary circles and the people in the Ottoman society were exploring different forms of fiction before the novel arrived, as illustrated with increasing publication of *meddah* stories of the nineteenth-century in the form of books. Özön argues "…by 1874, on the eve of the appearance of the novel proper, a version of practically every story in the *meddah* tradition had been commercially printed" (*Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı* 197-198 my trans.). All these practices show that the practice of narrative preceded the introduction of the genre to the Ottoman-Turkish society.

As a prominent literary critic, Michail M. Bakhtin makes a strong case of the novel, using Dostoyevsky as his prime example of a great novelist. In "Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel," one of the four essays in *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Bakhtin argues that the novel "novelized" other genres in eras when it became the dominant genre (4-5). This "novelization" made those genres more

flexible while changing their strict, canonical nature by inserting in these other genres a "contemporary reality (the open-ended present)" (Bakhtin 7). Although the roots of the novel should be sought in folklore, according to Bakhtin, the past, and traditional rhetoric "did not play a role in the formation of the novel," states Michael McKeon in his interpretation of Bakhtin's essay (330). Although McKeon's reading of Bakhtin's essay correlates with the latter's argument, Bakhtin's judgment specifies that the relationship between tradition and the novel contradicts the experience of the novel in nineteenth-century Turkey. The early Turkish novelists, in fact, utilized the themes and style of *meddah* stories in their novels. It illustrates a reversed effect from what Bakhtin suggests when he posits that the novel changes other genres. In the Turkish case, we see that novel had appropriated other genres into itself rather than taking it in "a zone that was first appropriated by the novel" (Bakhtin 7).

Nevertheless, from another perspective, Bakhtin's argument on the novel, although insinuated indirectly, becomes relevant. Bakhtin argues that the novelization process led other genres to become more attentive in keeping with reality (10). *Meddah* stories did not become more realist, nor were the fantastic elements of traditional folklore excluded. In contrast, realism promoted by the novel offered a new perspective on Turkish narration, and although unable to alter the nature of Turkish folklore and traditional narrative, the novel led to a decreasing interest in those genres. Being austere moralists, early Turkish novelists aimed to change literature's association with 'light entertainment' to ensure that the new genre of fiction, namely the novel, would be taken more seriously than the *meddah* stories as well as the traditional literature that embodied

mythical qualities and prioritized entertainment. Thus, Bakhtin's desire to enable a genre and a literary tradition, the novel and the Russian literary tradition seem, in fact, compatible with the Turkish case.

Heavily influenced by the reason of European Enlightenment, the early novelists thought that for literature to progress, they had to embody realism and engendered a moral lesson together with entertainment. Reality would be the strength of a writer to discipline his imagination and prevent him from exaggerating. Evin's book justifiably acknowledges a fundamental relation between the traditional forms of narrative fiction, particularly *meddah* stories in Ottoman literature. The first examples of Turkish novel emphasize that Turkish novel could not have been created "simply as a replica of European fiction" (41). However, he further claims that the first generation of novelists "remained indebted to the style developed by the storytellers, and as a result, the first novels written in Turkish smacked of amateurism" (40). I attest that although the first novels might not reflect the most mature stage of the Turkish novel, Evin's point of evaluation seems to locate itself in the Western standards for the novel. It overlooks the remarkable innovation that the early novelists achieved by transforming one mode of fiction into another while also maintaining a cultural continuation within the latter mode.

Adoption of the novel in Turkish literature was only one part of a much larger westernized movement in the Tanzimat period, and it was made possible by the developments of translation and journalism as well as other trends formed through prior developments. Those developments, to use Evin's term, included "the immediate

antecedents" of the novel in Turkish literature, namely different kinds of literary products.

Although the prose narrative was not as established as poetry, the novel, in fact, had an indirect precursor within Ottoman society. Performing as public entertainers in newly formed coffeehouses in cities during the sixteenth-century, *meddah*s started to perform for the public as well as the palace and gained considerable respect by the next century. The art of *meddah*s was the primary source that influenced the early novelists of the Ottoman Empire. One of the most significant aspects of their influence on the discussion of the novel, as Evin argues, is that *meddah*s became models for the early novelists because of the synthesis they created in the language of the elite and the populace. They, in fact, "provided the same type of entertainment to all," (42) which would not have been possible without their inclusion.

In the Ottoman cultural context, traditions were distinguished, not only regarding manners, aesthetics, and literary form but also with respect to everything else, including the language itself. The ability to cut across those barriers was quite remarkable when considering that a distinctive narrative style was developed as a direct result. Such a distinct narrative style culminated in the attempt to combine, not always happily, the formality and elegance of the upper-class parlance with the informality of conversational Turkish, but which captured the refinements of the language as spoken in Istanbul. This style provided a lively and infinitely more adaptable model for the early novelists than the formal Ottoman prose (30).

The art of *meddah*s, in a way, overcame the language disparity between the elite and the populace that the early novelists severely criticized. As one of the earliest forms of fiction – although in oral form –, *meddah* stories paved the way for the early novelists to produce fiction that would be accessible to both the elite and the people. Stylistic characteristics were adopted as well as themes of *meddah* stories that recurred in the early novels. One of those themes was the adventure story, which often had a cosmopolitan feel imbued within the story and often featured non-Turkish characters that represented different ethnic groups. This kind of story allowed *meddah*s to represent the diverse ethnic composition of the Ottoman society but also let them imitate different accents, thus, demonstrating their language acumen even further.

Slavery, courtship, a young Turkish man falling in love with a non-Turkish woman, who then tries to convert him to Christianity, were recurring themes in the early fictional works, such as *Müsameretname* [Night Entertainment], first published in 1872, by Tanzimat writer Emin Nihat Efendi that consists of seven long stories. Early novelists like Ahmet Mithat Efendi used *meddah*-like stories presented by storytellers in his novels. His work *Letaif-i Rivayat* [Pleasant Stories] (1871) foretells his version of the novel with didactic elements, and it shows how he initiates a transition from *meddah* stories to the novel by "hammering sense and substance into the former" (Evin 54). Ahmet Mithat and some of his contemporaries were "looking for a synthesis of Western civilization and Turkish culture" (32), utilizing *meddah* stories and represented them in the novel form.

For classical Ottoman literature, the rhetoric, the expression, and eloquence in verse were the most important elements of style and literary production. The prevalence of rhyming the prose, so much so that it often became incomprehensible, was partially responsible for prose remaining as an obscure genre that fell into disrepute. This obsession was obviously a tribute to the verse that Ottoman authors could not stop practicing, but nevertheless created a significant obstacle for their contemporary Tanzimat reformists, as well as successors, since they knew they needed an openly expressed prose rather than a rhymed verse in prose. Ottoman intellectuals before and during the Tanzimat were aware of the need for a different version of prose. This section encapsulates the literary atmosphere where the ever-evolving novel entered. Thus, its reception can be better described as a practical method to utilize existing cultural material rather than a literary invention that Ottoman literature had passively received from the West.

The Turkish Novel, Politics, and Modernism

> *The modern time of progress and the anti-modern time of 'tradition' are twins who failed to recognize one another: The idea of an identical repetition of the past and that of a radical rupture with any past are two symmetrical results of a single conception of time.*
>
> — Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, 76

Contemporary Turkish novel has always involved politics since the genre was first introduced to Turkish readers. The Ottoman past and transition from an empire to a

republic play a significant role in shaping twentieth-century Turkish literature, and in particular, the novel. Resistance against the values of the collapsed Empire and a longing for the old days of the Empire represented a traumatic dilemma. This issue became a recurring theme depicting the discontinuity of its culture and can be observed in most of the Turkish literary works written during the past century.

Twentieth-century Turkish literature reflected cultural and political climates found within the Turkish Republic, founded in 1923. This date marked the political end of the six-hundred-year-old Ottoman Empire. However, just as so many modernisms, the Turkish Republic viewed its future aspirations through the lens of its cultural past as a means of grafting the old with the new. This endeavor attempted to distinguish itself from the past without sacrificing the totality of the past as an obsolete relic. The transition from the Empire to the Republic was not going to be as smooth on the cultural level as it *supposedly* was in the political sphere, as many Republicans had assumed.

The newly established Republic, under the guidance of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, embodied a nationalist and secular ideology. Kemalism advocated the idea that all cultural and political associations with the Empire had to be separated from the modern Turkish state. This approach turned out to be problematic in dramatically various ways that many of the state authority figures of the day could not foresee. Most intellectuals of the period[19] agreed that they had to create a body of *national* literature in order to create a

[19] The intellectuals of the period who supported Republican cultural transformation included Ömer Seyfettin (1884 – 1920), Ziya Gökalp (1876 – 1924), Refik Halit Karay (1888 – 1965), Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (1890 – 1966). These writers wrote during the period right after the establishment of the Republic in 1923. By that time, Turkey was a country that experienced a decade of continuous wars, including Balkan Wars and World War I. These group of authors and many of their contemporaries tried to

new purely Turkish national identity. Concurrently, in a view to create such a national identity, they had to renounce much of the cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire. Because of the cosmopolitan nature of the Ottoman society, this presented a unique challenge for the Republican perspective within the Turkish nation state that sought to identify itself with being ethnically Turkish or accepting Turkishness as one's identity. Attempts toward achieving the Turkish cultural revolution[20] began in the aftermath of the foundation of the Republic. The language reform (1932) was one of the most influential social reforms found within the Republican cultural revolution. It abolished the Islamic-centrist Arabic script in favor of a secular, Romanized alphabet. Moreover, a purge of words that were not explicitly Turkish in origin was promoted. Pure Turkish, as it was called, was the most important part of the nation state. Consequently, the idea of language became a significant component of becoming a *nation* because speaking in purely Turkish words was a manifestation of supporting the Republican Turkification, and nationalist ideology. Cultural institutions promoted the use of pure Turkish in literary works produced during the nationalist literature movement of the 1920s and 1930s.

The salient separation from the Ottoman past, both within the spectrum of the cultural and political realm, evolved into a cultural trauma for many in the new nation

---

accumulate a body of literature that the newly established nation could call its own. Interestingly, these authors do not question, blame or criticize the experience and idea of war but see it as a tool to create a sense of nation and a necessary act to build a nation out of the ashes of the Empire. The main idea they had in common was that a new nation could be built by building a new literature, and this notion creates nationalist literature, which peaked during the 1920s.

[20] Erdağ Göknar defines Turkish cultural revolution as a period when "a promotion of national identity in Turkism began." He lists three events that marked the beginning of the Turkish cultural revolution and separated religion and religious symbols from the public arena: "the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate (1922); the declaration of the Republic, and the transfer of the capital from Istanbul to Ankara (1923); and the abolition of the caliphate (1924)" Göknar (2008) pp. 472 – 503.

state. This transition was established within the geography left behind the Ottoman Empire, which constitutes the modern borders of Turkey today. People, who became the members of the new Turkish Republic, had previously identified themselves as Ottoman or Ottoman-Turks. Excising the "Ottoman" cultural prefix from their self-identity did not come as easily as it was on the linguistic level. For many, the collapse of the Empire turned into an identity crisis, which resonated in deeper levels of culture and was manifested through literature. The loss, as well as the disownment of the cultural past, became a major theme that many Turkish authors expressed throughout the late twentieth-century.

The discontinuity of the Ottoman culture and literature resonated in the gradual ethnic homogenization of the Turkish nation state. The initial years of the Republic were soon to be remarkably homogeneous compared to the exceedingly multicultural Ottoman culture. The modern Turkish state lost its minorities through nationalist underpinnings. The most controversial issue regarding the gradual decrease of ethnic diversity in the nation has been the Armenian question, which remains to be confronted by not only Turkey but also the rest of the world, inflecting contemporary Turkey's cultural, social, and political relations with the rest of the world. The Turks allegedly systematically killed the majority of the Armenian population, living under the Ottoman Empire, in the aftermath of World War I. Arguing that Turks were also killed during the 1915 period, Turkish officials counter the Armenian position with an explanation of the conditions, such as the immediacy of the war, illnesses, extreme weather conditions that resulted in the death of a number of Armenians in the region. Opening up some of the relevant

archival documents to the public,[21] Turkey strongly refuses the accusation of an ethnic cleansing against the Armenians. Considered an exclusively sensitive topic, the Armenian issue has generated a number of discussions, protests, and publicity around the world. My research does not delve into a thorough analysis of the Armenian issue; however, Orhan Pamuk's statement on the topic, which I further discuss in Chapter 4, and the events occurred in the aftermath of his statement, underline the strong implications of the Armenian issue as it spreads in the realm of literary and cultural analysis of Turkey.

Most literary works that focused on distancing themselves from the Ottoman cultural past and turning to the West revealed different literary movements favoring different ideologies during the same century. These movements included Turkish nationalism, which peaked roughly during the 1920s[22] after the Balkan Wars. It became ardent and partly synchronic with the period of unquestioned westernization. This contrast of values and ideals translated into an absolute, positive attitude toward any social or cultural practice that originated in the West. The irony of many twentieth-century nationalism movements is that they impose a western view of the state in the service of promoting a local identity, as in the case of Turkey.

Westernization, whether intentionally or by happenstance, was often used interchangeably with modernism in the Republican Turkey during the 1930s. Ironically, in the Turkish case, nationalism was understood as disowning the Ottoman cultural

---

[21] December 29, 2016. web.archive.org/web/20100209184319/http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr:80/kitap/.
[22] This period was not, however, the first time that Turks tried to apply reforms that aimed to westernize the country. The first attempts were made during the Tanzimat Period, a period of reformations, which started in 1839 and lasted until 1876 with the first Constitutional Era.

identity while simultaneously embracing a new, solely Turkish national and cultural identity – an identity largely modeled after Europe. However, the attempts to modernize and create a new Turkish cultural identity by disregarding the Ottoman past proved to be problematic during the following decades. The expansive and highly cosmopolitan nature of the fallen empire was gradually being reduced to a single nation state, which was politically and culturally limited to the borders of the Republic. Although the debate about westernization did not begin with the Republic, and the concerns about westernization as a mere imitation of the West also existed during the Tanzimat period (1839 – 1876), nineteenth-century attempts to reform the society did not create the same cultural transformation as the Republican modernization had caused.

The Republican modernization project reflected on literature through its social and cultural consequences as a recurring identity problem. Considering the Empire's declining political power due to corruptions, the Republic was the ultimate solution for the officials of the time. However, the Republic could have reinforced their modernization on a sound ground of the centuries of culture, rather than using the rhetoric of the West about the Ottoman Empire in order to succeed in the new nation's modernization. This issue can be seen in modern Turkish literature in distinctive ways that are necessary to understand the purpose of this study. The difference can be roughly divided into two groups. On the one hand, there was the literature that supporters of nationalism and westernization produced (although they differed in their ideologies). The

authors in this first group[23] used the power of their pen to convince the general public – only a small percentage of which was literate at the time – to believe in the benefit of a new nation state without taking cultural or literary elements from the Ottoman past.

The other group of intellectuals, however, was able to predict possible dramatic consequences of a strictly nationalist approach and the dilemma it was going to generate in the following decades. A "divided sense of self and identity" (Göknar, "The Novel in Turkish" 475) was formed and persisted. Its influence can be observed through the problematic clashing of cultural identities in modern Turkey. This second group includes, among others, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk, who are the two prominent authors that illustrate the possible and actual consequences of the distressing modernization project. In their novels, they exquisitely and comprehensively summarize the burgeoning consequences that have afflicted the Turks from a cultural perspective.

The anti-Ottoman sentiment favored by the nationalists defined the Ottoman culture as an opposite of modernism. This negating definition, which defined being Turkish by what it was not rather than what it was, is demonstrative of the assertion that the Republic itself had difficulty defining what modern Turkey or what a modern Turk constitutes. Because one of the main goals of the Republic was to modernize by taking the West as its model, the Ottoman social and political practices, which were considered to be culturally "traditional," was antithetical to modernity and therefore had to be left behind and, in many ways, even despised. Such an antagonistic attitude allowed for a gradual distancing from Ottoman language, traditions, and lifestyle. Considering the

---

[23] Some major authors in this group include Ziya Gökalp and Mehmet Emin Yurdakul.

general disregard toward the Ottoman past during the first decades of the republic – an echo of Western cultural and historical attitudes toward the Ottoman Empire – serves as the basis for the recent tendency located within Turkish literary circles toward more research and, consequently more writing on the Ottoman culture, is worth particular analysis. My choice of authors for this study allows me to categorize twentieth-century Turkish literature in the thematic stages inherent within the ideological approaches.

The most prominent themes these authors use, namely modernism, westernization, and nationalism, were effective in the formation of literary movements, such as *Fecr-i Âti* [The Dawn of the Future Movement], which is often described as a variation of Théophile Gautier's doctrine of *l'art pour l'art*. This Francophile movement was an illustration of the irony of domesticating Western Orientalism in the "Orient" and reflecting it upon the Turkish people who could not fully embrace the Republican cultural enforcements. *Milli Edebiyat* [The National Literature] was another considerably influential movement. One of the significant aspects of the National Literature was the assertion of literature as being particularly Turkish and not Ottoman, as it was previously postulated.[24]

---

[24] *Fecr-i Âti* (The Dawn of the Future Movement), which came into existence around the literary magazine called *Servet-i Fünûn* at 1909. Its existence as a movement did not last long; however, the authors of the group continued writing individually. The Dawn of the Future Movement's main characteristic was that they questioned Western literary forms and styles and sought a distinctively Turkish literature. Some of the authors identifying themselves with this movement include Ahmed Haşim (1884 – 1933) and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1889 – 1974). Nationalism as a political ideology had a substantial influence on modern Turkish literature during the first decades of the twentieth-century in Turkey. *Milli Edebiyat* (The National Literature Movement) was another literary change that had a lasting influence. The representatives of this literary movement identified itself with a particularly Turkish national identity. It was mainly promoted by one of the first political parties of the second constitutional government of Turkey instituted in 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress, also known as the *Young Turks*. Literature of this period called National Literature. One of the significant aspects of this period was the assertion of literature as being particularly

What Tanpınar and Pamuk have in common distinguishes them from their contemporaries but also aligns with some of their nineteenth-century predecessors, who concerned themselves with similar issues. In their writing, they deal with certain ideas of East and West and the Turkish presence between these two supposedly separate worlds. The cultural influence of the Ottoman past manifested itself robustly in the conflict between the old and new practices of daily, intellectual, and political life in Turkey during the twentieth-century. Tanpınar's and Pamuk's approaches are often distinct from each other. They outline some of the major ideas in twentieth-century Turkish literature, most of which constitute issues mentioned above. They present these issues through their works that surpass their time and locality by finding readers of Turkish literature all around the globe today. What makes their works influential and long-standing includes their distinctive attitudes toward significant moments of history, such as the transition period from the Empire to the Republic, World War I, and World War II. These culturally significant historical moments allow scholars to interpret Turkey's literary presence within the globalization of the world today. The way they express their ideas are rather

---

Turkish and not Ottoman as it was previously done. This movement used the literary magazine *Genç Kalemler* [Young Pens] as their way of reaching out to the literate public. The first issue of the magazine published a seminal article, entitled *Yeni Lisan* [New Language], which diversified around ideas of national identity during the following decades that became a major theme later in Turkish literature. The article mainly pointed out that Turkish literature had always utilized either the East, meaning the Ottoman Divan literature, or the West as seen in *Fecr-i Âti* movement, but failed to recognize Turkey as itself. It promoted the purification of Turkish language from Arabic and Persian influence. Ziya Gökalp (1876 – 1924) and Ömer Seyfettin (1884 – 1920) were among the prominent authors of this movement. Republican Literature, the other significant literary movement emerged with the founding of Turkish Republic in 1923 after the Ottoman's defeat in the WWI and the Turkish War of Independence (1919 – 1923). This movement aligned with the national literature movement and found its main source of interest in Turkish folk tradition. This period also coincided with the language reform that was enacted in 1928 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the Arabic script from the Ottomans was replaced with the Latin alphabet and resulted in an increase of literacy in the country.

unorthodox for their contemporaries, most of whom followed the Republican metanarrative.

The current scholarship and literary production in contemporary Turkish literature has begun to pay a considerable tribute to the Ottoman past. This interest on a local level has resonated in the representation and reception of Turkish literature around the world. The Ottoman theme is being pronounced more vigorously and clearly in many recent literary works that invite scholars and authors to revisit the long-forgotten Empire. However, other than Erdağ Göknar's recent works,[25] existing scholarship has yet to offer thorough criticism and analysis about how the Ottoman theme affects the literary status of Turkey in the world. The history of the Ottoman Turkish world often occurs in contemporary Turkish literature to help position Turkish literature on the literary scene of the world. Thus, I analyze this trend within the scope of this project. Through the works of the authors I examine, I aim to contribute to the existing scholarship and provide a basis to undertake further research. The authors reviewed in this study provide intriguing aspects of the twentieth-century Turkish literary world with their varying attitudes toward the Ottoman past, which, in return, serve as a demonstration for how those approaches to the past shape Turkey's presence in world literature today. This analysis reveals that Tanpınar and Pamuk, in different decades, have different views of both the local cultural inheritance, but share a tenacious potential to speak to a global readership.

[25] Particularly Göknar's book *Orhan Pamuk, Secularism, and Blasphemy: The Politics of the Turkish Novel* (2013).

Each writer approaches the Ottoman past differently, and the convergences and divergences reveal both much about the implications of the project of modernism and modernization, both of which began with Atatürk in the first quarter of the twentieth-century. To review the Ottoman past is ironically productive and controversial within Turkish literary circles. This project, through close and historicized readings of the novels of these authors, suggests not only how the new cosmopolitan phenomenon of literary neo-Ottomanism has come to be, but it also offers an assessment of why that particular project is so appropriate to our globalized and cosmopolitan present moment.

The Ottoman theme that has been picked up by many Turkish authors and historians during the last few decades has become a distinguishing feature of contemporary Turkish literature today, especially when evaluated within the sphere of world literature. There are different reasons for this: The history and influence of the Ottoman Empire have not been incorporated in large-scale studies around the world except some recent examples. Therefore, Ottoman Empire does not possess the *accurate* representation that it deserves within Western literary and historical accounts. Most studies that originated in Europe during the twentieth-century fail to present objective and well-informed arguments about the Empire's role in world history.

The recent revival of interest in the Empire's history regarding politics, as well as scholarly circles around the world, however, has triggered sentiments within the literary circles in Turkey and increased intellectual curiosity toward one of the biggest empires in world history. Promising research has very recently been undertaken. Academic conferences on the Ottomans has seen a notable influx of scholars being invited to host

seminars about the Ottoman Empire from around the world to further the understanding of the Empire and challenge various accounts regarding the extent of its role in world history,[26] including entanglements between the Ottoman Empire and its Western neighbors. Moreover, the number of books written on the Ottoman Empire during the last few decades shows a considerable increase.[27] These promising efforts to create more objective scholarly research opens new ways of rethinking the Ottoman Empire and allows a reassessment of many unquestioned representations or, as they were, misrepresentations of the Ottoman past while re-writing many of them. While looking at the global revival of interest in the Ottoman Empire, understanding how the Ottoman theme has become prominent for the contemporary Turkish intelligentsia is crucial since the local interest often helps shape the global reception of the issue and vice versa.

The most ubiquitous literary genre in which the Ottoman theme has recently been revived in Turkey is the novel. Due to its rather complex nature, Turkish novel embodies a position that complicates and goes beyond the cliché description of the East-West dilemma since its inception. Göknar paradoxically, but rightly, argues that "'Ottoman,'

---

[26] Some of the academic conferences among many others that took place within the last few years are: "The Ottomans and Britain in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries" (Newnham College, Cambridge 2009); "Working in the Ottoman Empire and in Turkey: Ottoman and Turkish Labor History within a Global Perspective" (Istanbul Bilgi University, 2011); "The Ottoman Woman: A Comparative Perspective" (Newnham College, Cambridge, 2011); "Well-Connected Domains: Intersections of Asia and Europe in the Ottoman Empire" (Heidelberg, 2011).

[27] According to MLA International Bibliography, from 1990 to 2013 there are 243 academic journal articles, 95 book chapters, and 16 books have been published around the world on the Ottoman Empire. The number of books and historical novels that have the Ottomans as their main subject have also increased considerably in Turkey. Not only Turkish literature but Turkish cinema and even television series as well showed a prominent interest in producing films and series that not only present different forms of Ottoman world but also are set mostly during the centuries when the Ottoman Empire was having its peak in power. Such productions that appreciate and glorify the Empire drew significant interest from the Turkish audience.

'Muslim,' 'Turkish,' and European all at the same time. … It didn't simply imitate Europe, but experimented with its innovations in multiple ways. To be sure, Turkey did not just translate and receive the novel from Europe; it rewrote the novel based on its own social and historical contingencies" ("The Novel in Turkish" 476). Considering the complex nature of the Turkish novel helps readers understand the novel has become the genre through which Turkish literature expanded beyond both its physical and symbolic borders. Moreover, it shows how the contemporary Turkish novel denies the assertion that it is merely an import from Europe.

The Novelization of the Novel in Turkish

There is perhaps no better anthropological or aesthetic artifact with which to read social change, to gauge resistance and to trace the scars of history and ideology on local populations than the novel.

— Erdağ Göknar, "The Novel in Turkish: Narrative Tradition to Nobel Prize"

The history of the Turkish novel provides a compelling account of the current status of the novel in Turkey. In his article "Aşırı Batılılaşma" [Excessive Westernization], Şerif Mardin argues that "Osmanlı romanı, …Türk modenleşmesini incelemek için en az yararlanılmış bir kaynaktır, oysa birçok roman yazıldıkları zamana ait … bize önemli bilgiler verir." [The Ottoman novel is a source that has been utilized the least to understand Turkish modernism while many novels, in fact, give us significant information about their historical time.] (*Türk Modernleşmesi* 32, my trans). In Turkish

literature, the novel has often been a medium through which authors criticized, questioned and promoted different political approaches and ideologies beginning with the first examples of the genre in Turkish.

Introduced to Turkish literature first from the West, the novel was the most suitable form of literature to embody such a task due to its prolific rise in a time of cultural transformation in Turkey. The general population could not have easy access to Ottoman poetry due to its embellished language that only the elite could relate and understand. In the twentieth-century, prose, in the form of novel on the other hand, was becoming increasingly accessible as the population learned to use 'pure Turkish' and started to distance itself even more from the language and culture of the Ottomans. The novel was the most readily available genre that could reach out to readers and convey its authors' political, ideological, or cultural motivations.

The genre of the novel was first introduced to Turkish literature through translations from French. *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (1699) by François de la Mothe-Fénelon was the first novel translated into Turkish as *Terceme-i Telemak* in 1862 by Yusuf Kamil Paşa (1808 – 1876), an Ottoman statesman. The choice of this novel was, by all means, not coincidental. Described as a prose epic (Moore 31), this didactic novel narrates the travels of Telemachus, the son of Ulysses, with his mentor. Tanzimat authors like Namık Kemal liked *Terceme-i Telemak* due to its didactic elements and its ability to connect usefulness with delight. The introduction of the genre with this specific novel satisfied Tanzimat novelists' desire to replace the rhetorical style of *Divan* poetry just as

Fénelon's departure from the eloquent style of previous French poetry with Fénelon's experiment on a language that continued the Homeric poem in prose.

Introduced during the Tanzimat era in the nineteenth-century, when the Ottoman Empire was trying to modernize its culture by taking the West as its model, the novel became a tool to experience the lifestyle of western cultures and was often well-received by many in the Ottoman Turkish society. After an initial period of translations mostly from French, Ottoman novel was often concerned with social and ethical issues ("The Novel in Turkish" 473). With the increasing number of translations from the West, a form of westernization was being engraved within Ottoman culture and literature; novel played a particularly important role in this influence. While some original novels celebrated Western cultural values, some others showed discontent with unexamined westernization describing it as corrupted narratives. First examples of the latter kind of novels[28] utilized the genre to convey criticism and satire of alleged western lifestyles[29] that were being introduced to Ottoman society by various mediums, including literature, during the Reformation period. The turn of the twentieth-century brought with it a

---

[28] Namık Kemal *Intibah* (1876), Ahmet Mithat Efendi *Felatun Bey'le Rakım Efendi* (1875), Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem *Araba Sevdası* (1896) are a few examples, where Western values associated with modernism are criticized through the genre of novel.

[29] Such values are satirized most openly in the novel *Araba Sevdası*. A bourgeois, the protagonist Bihruz Bey, is an admirer and imitator of French culture. He despises Turkish culture and considers French culture as a product of a superior civilization. Turkish, for him, is a rough and rude language, so he tries to speak French. However, his French is not good enough so he squeezes French words in his Turkish language. He is a caricature of a French dandy, who drives around in his luxurious horse carriage and buys expensive clothes from France. The novel presents a heavy criticism of the rich people of the period, the families of the Young Turks (from French Les Jeunes Turcs). The novel is an allegory of the westernization attempts of the period. The protagonist understands westernization as a superficial imitation of expensive and often corrupted lifestyle that only values appearances. The protagonist is ridiculed throughout the novel due to his (mis)understanding of westernization.

paradigm shift, therefore making the novel an increasingly politicized form of literature. Authors used the novel to reflect upon political changes and ideologies in the state. Thus, during the 1920s and 1930s, the novel mainly became a source to encourage nationalization in Republican Turkey.

The Turkish Language Reform occurred as an outcome of nationalism. It both reflected and prompted political ideologies of the Republic. In 1928, the first stage of the Turkish language reform replaced Perso-Arabic script with the Latin phonetic alphabet and gradually expurgated Arabic and Persian words. The percentage of the literate populace was significantly small during those years. The idea of 'pure Turkish,' that is to say the Turkish that cleaned from Persian and Arabic linguistic influence functioned in parallel with Turkish nationalism, and the bold idea of 'one language, one nation' through "the nationalization of the Turkish language" (Ertürk x). In a few decades, subsequent generations were not able to understand Ottoman Turkish in writing.

The language barrier facilitated the disownment of the Ottoman past as well as its literature that the new nation-state promoted. Republican authors of the time produced a number of novels in modern Turkish to contribute to the accumulation of a 'national literature.' It was also a movement away from classical Ottoman poetry. The language reform prevented successive generations from having textual access to the Ottoman past. The relatively small number of people who were literate during the reform consequently reflected on the population who learned to read and write in the new language. Thus, the efforts of the undeliberate influence of the pre-existing narrative forms on the early

Turkish novels were further removed from the literature of the Republic, which aggressively embodied a western style.

Beginning in the 1980s, some contemporary Turkish authors revived the habit of using Perso-Arabic words as a political stance against Kemalist-nationalist ideology that had been influential throughout the century. The choice of whether the use or the elimination of old Turkish words in their language allowed authors to show their approval or opposition to the Republican reforms of language. While some authors deliberately chose to use words with Perso-Arabic origin to show that they opposed to the prevailing purification of Turkish, others became eager to use or even coin pure Turkish words as a way of showing their support for the language reform. Republican modernism, however, cannot be simply explained by these two groups of authors. Ironically, throughout the century, some other authors used transliterated French and English words in so-called 'purified Turkish' to emphasize their understanding of 'westernization' and 'modernism,' but paradoxically subscribing to an unsophisticated imitation. While Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar clung to the words with a Perso-Arabic origin, pro-Republican authors, such as Ziya Gökalp and Ömer Seyfettin refused such words as well as transliterations. Similar to Tanpınar, Pamuk participated and contributed to this movement as a way of resurrecting the Ottoman past through language and consequently through literature.

The type of various dialogisms and polyphonies presented in the language, culture, and politics as well as in the literary tradition makes Bakhtin's theory a useful method for the analysis of the Turkish novel, particularly the authors in question in this study. In his description of Dostoyevsky's novels, Bakhtin states that "…a plurality of

independent and unmerged voices and consciousness, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices" are the chief characteristics of the famous author's novels (*Problems* 6). Dialogism, as the multiplicity of perspectives and voices, becomes especially useful when reading Pamuk whose works engage themselves with other works and voices while presenting multiple and often incompatible elements of different narrative perspectives that are of equal value.

The level of ideologies that are reflected in the novels studied here counters dialogism and polyphony in the narration. The plurality of ideologies, such as Kemalism, Republican nationalism, Turkism, Anatolianism, and phenomena, such as self-orientalism, reflect the heterogeneous nature of the politics and ideologies as well as their outcomes within the Republican Turkey regardless of how strongly it defined itself as purely Turkish. Kemalist, Republican nationalist, and Turkist ideologies intersected in their approach to the new Turkish nation-state as a mono-ethnic, monolingual one that does not embody the cosmopolitanism of the Ottoman era.

Self-orientalism or 'internal orientalism' indicates an appropriated and re-directed understanding of Orientalism. Over three decades after its first publication, a large corpus of writings on Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) consisting mostly of its critiques has been generated. Igniting centuries-long resentment against the West, Said's book shifted the discourse on Orientalism to a rather polemical point, where authors and scholars reacted. It became a pioneer and a magnum opus for postcolonial studies and attained a canonical status in its own way. The most detrimental impact of *Orientalism*, in the long run, stood out in its role in polarizing binary oppositions, primarily "East" and "West."

Creating its own discourse, the book spread infectiously and caused more stereotyping, this time in the form of Occidentalism. Thus, the book made its claims about western prejudices against the East and generated other prejudices. While Turkish culture and literature cannot be categorized under the postcolonial perspective, Orientalism and the stereotypes it created about Eastern cultures in the West found a prevailing place in the Western accounts of the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This approach led to self-orientalism that emerged during the first decades of the Republic as a result of ideologies mentioned above that became influential in different periods of twentieth-century Turkish history.

I define self-orientalism in the Turkish context as a way of interpreting and representing the Ottoman culture through the eyes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century West. It brought the often negative stereotypes that are attributed to the Ottoman Empire in the West throughout the Empire's existence. During the first decades of the Republic, the Turkish intelligentsia and the public found very little in common. While originally defining themselves with the qualities of the Ottoman culture, Turkish people adopted a western way of interpreting their own past, which gave way to self-orientalism.

The stereotypes that Orientalism perpetuated are rooted in a long history. The conquest of Constantinople on May 29, 1453 is considered to have marked the beginning of an era in which the image of the Turk in Europe is defined as a frightening power and a threat for European Christendom. Although from fifteenth to sixteenth-century the main image of the Turk consisted of the fear it created, which penetrated into European

cultures and was expressed by various phrases, such as Giovanni Ricci's "*Obsessiona Turka*," Italians' '*Mama i Turchi*' or, as often described as the "Turkish menace" or "bloodthirsty Turk" (Jezernik 9) during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These images of the Turk left their places to other stereotypes of orientalist views by the nineteenth century. As the reputation and power of the Empire began to decline after the loss at the Siege of Vienna in 1683, the image of the Turk turned into duskier images, such as "the Sick man of Europe."[30] The epithets that the "Sick Man of Europe" was given included 'savage' and 'barbarian' Turks that were the cursed enemy of Christianity.

Literature significantly contributed to form a new image of the Turk in the West. The pre-Victorian and sexually charged British novel, *The Lustful Turk, or Lascivious Scenes from a Harem* (1828) first published anonymously by John Benjamin Brookes, among other books that Europe at the peak of Orientalism and at the threshold of modernism was reading and distributing. The "Turk" of the nineteenth-century was the "Ottoman" of the modern Turkish nation. The need to ethnically differentiate the Ottoman-Turkish identity from the modern Turk became a strategy of modernization during the twentieth-century. Such representations embodied and employed common stereotypes about the Empire as an effort to define the modern Turkish nation and

[30] According to the British journalist and writer Christopher de Bellaigue, this phrase is erroneously attributed to Tsar Nicholas I of Russia. Bellaigue argues that the letter from Sir George Hamilton Seymour, the British ambassador to St. Petersburg, to Lord John Russell in 1853 forms the basis of this attribution. March 21, 2015, www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2001/mar/08/turkeys-hidden-past/#fn1-764092523.

distinguish it from its Ottoman past, similar to Europe that tried to define its own identity as opposed to the Turk.

The nationalist, secular, and Kemalist intelligentsia reflected their borrowed modernism as a binary to the traditionalism of the public who comparatively failed to modernize as the elite group did. However, realizing that the gap among these groups got bigger and the Republican nationalist ideology was not able to fix the problem of not turning modern overnight, the intelligentsia turned its face to the public, and thus Anatolian consciousness emerged by the 1950s. These different senses of identity contributed to the notion of "divided self" in which the people of modern Turkey ended up finding themselves.

The nationalist ideology of the 1930s and the 1940s left its place to an ideology that aimed Anatolian consciousness during the 1950s and 1960s. During this period, some members of the Turkish intelligentsia draw attention to how the elite neglected Anatolian people living in the small towns of Turkey. Their novels, poems, and short stories presented Anatolian characters in their various local accents. From the 1970s till the end of the century, the focus of Turkish novel moved away from national issues towards more individual narratives. With the 1980 coup, an even more considerable change in the themes of the novel began to be seen. Göknar states that "the future oriented movements for progress had reached an impasse, and after the 1980 military coup, the focus on national realities turned to fantasy, the imagination, pre-national Ottoman history and, generally, to an emphasis on form and aesthetic style over content and social engagement" ("The Novel in Turkish" 473).

The post-1980 period also marked the beginning of the notion that the way Republican modernity was understood generated cultural problems. The authors of the period looked for an outlet to express their ideas about Turkish modernity as well as Turkish identity. This was a period when the discontent and disappointment with the secular and Republican ideology had been voiced more explicitly, and the resurrection of the Ottoman past became one of the outlets to express such notions. Besides, the novel became the primary medium through which such ideas were expressed. The authors of the period began to explore the Ottoman past that had been banned from the nation's agenda. This was not simply a nostalgia felt toward the Ottoman past, but a curiosity to discover what being Turkish and living in modern Turkey could mean for those who could not entirely identify with the metanarratives of the state. The glories of the Empire excited many but authors, such as Pamuk, soon discovered a healthier way to approach to the Ottoman past and not to repeat the same mistakes as their Republican predecessors committed by imagining and imposing a glorified history of the Turks that was not an accurate representation of the Ottoman Empire.

This period opened up a new direction for Turkish novel, which can be described as 'neo-Ottoman.'[31] One critical question to ask about this path that Turkish novel has taken would be: What does the neo-Ottoman entail, particularly with the novel? This kind of novel sheds light upon previously unknown or misrepresented details of the Ottoman culture and makes claims to acknowledge cultural advancement as well as shortcomings

[31] For a definition of "neo-Ottomanism" and its use in literature, see the section "Literary Neo-Ottomanism and the Significance of the Case Studies: The Need for This Project."

of the imperial past. As a result, the claims of Republican and nationalist literature for the backwardness of the Ottoman is further trivialized.

Significant examples of such novels are Pamuk's and Tanpınar's that I examine in detail in the case studies chapters. The exquisite details of the Ottoman culture, based on cultural artifacts and knowledge in these novels, support the notion that the precursors of the modern Turk were more sophisticated than It was thought to be. However, this type of presentation of the culture does not necessarily claim that the Ottomans were equally advanced as their contemporaries in Europe were. It suggests, on the other hand, that they were not the paragon of backwardness that Republican politics claimed them to be.

The discourse on Turkish modernism is further enriched with such a revised approach toward the Ottomans as well: the supposedly pre-modern Ottoman society had, in fact, already begun to modernize long before modern Turkey did. Moreover, they succeeded in protecting their cultural identity even before the phenomenon of disassociating themselves away from the parochial argument. From the perspective of literariness, these novels, as well as others written during the twentieth-century, challenge restricted viewss on the Turkish novel. Such beliefs often describe the Turkish novel as mere imitations of European novels. Nevertheless, particular works from various authors, including Pamuk and Tanpınar, present examples that cannot be put in one single category according to their themes, styles, perspectives on the Ottoman past or Republican present of Turkey. While even the supporters of nationalist Turkish literature manifest differences in their understanding of nationalist literature or what Turkism entails, it would be difficult to define modern Turkish literature in a singular manner.

A closer look at the ways in which culture, art, and literature were practiced, and how the concept of cultural identity, as understood in the Ottoman society, is presented in the neo-ottoman novel reveal that such practices and perspectives were not monolithic. Unlike nationalist Turkism, multicultural and multiethnic Ottoman society would allow such multiplicities to exist together in a cosmopolitan society. The synchronically hybrid Ottoman society produced multiple perspectives on various forms of art. Pamuk's *My Name is Red* and *The White Castle*, Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* and *The Time Regulation Institute* as representations of Ottoman miniature painting and classical music are several examples to strengthen this argument. Additionally, these novels help understand the modern Turkish novel and its relation to the past when considered within the conversation about Turkish nationalism. The authors' approach to the genre of the novel as well as the Turkish novel examined below complements the contextual analysis provided in this section.

The Novel and the Novelist According to Tanpınar and Pamuk

A comparison of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk's understanding and interpretation of the Turkish novel as well as how they see the genre of the novel offers useful insights to the analysis of their works. In this section, I examine each writer's thoughts about the novel that they directly or indirectly expressed in their various writings. Based on the sources I analyze, I argue that they use the genre for similar political and cultural issues; however, there is a difference in their understanding of the genre. While both Tanpınar and Pamuk thought that a good Turkish novel could be

written when it takes from the Ottoman cultural past and take stylistic features from the western traditions of the novel, they did not target the same reader. While Tanpınar's target reader was more on the national level, Pamuk openly tries to avoid being described as a "Turkish" writer, or as a writer who is writing for the Turkish reader. This approach to their writing functions as one of the keys to understanding their view of the novel.

The two authors are strong examples of the tradition of the novel in Turkish history. Novelists have the ability to reconstruct actual historical settings and rewrite an accepted version of history; because of this, they are, in fact, not much different from historians whose historical accounts reflect their interpretations of history after they document historical facts. This ability of novelists as well as historians gives the writer the freedom to contest and weaken existing taboos of the past and lead the reader to question historical accounts. As history takes a considerable part in the Turkish novel and particularly in the works of these two writers, I argue that their approach to Ottoman Turkish history and the aftermath of the foundation of the Republic allow Turkish novel present itself to the global reader while revising its Ottoman history. Thus, the Turkish novel speaks to the world through a critical literary representation of Ottoman Turkish history.

Tanpınar differs from many of his contemporaries, who were writing during the rise of Republican nationalism. The Republican novel had a close relationship with the national ideologies of secularism, modernism, and westernization. Writers in this period included those who were also appointed to different political appointments as diplomats. Tanpınar was a member of the parliament between 1942 – 46 and supported the

Republican regime as an ideal form of government. However, he was not entirely content with the way the regime was imposed but happy with its ideal to create a modern world for the Turks. What made him different from many other writers was that he chose not to contribute to propagandist and politically didactic writing to promote Republican nationalism as others did.[32] For him, writing was more of an art than a tool conditioned by authorities' political inclining. His novels present political ideas of his own, showing his artistic knowledge and taste while avoiding a philosophically narrow perspective. Guided by his notion of a synthesis between the past and the present and transcending such a dichotomy, Tanpınar does not disown the Ottoman past. Literary critic Mehmet Aydın describes Tanpınar as a "batıcı-gelenekçi-modern" [westernist-traditionalist-modern] writer because in his approach to the modern Tanpınar is not critical of the past (32). His sympathy toward a modernism that is built with the knowledge and culture of the past constitutes the basis of his novels.

Tanpınar wrote three short essays on novel writing where he examines modern Turkish novel and reveals details of his understanding of the genre. The articles "Romana ve Romancıya Dair Notlar" [Notes about Novel and Novelist] he wrote in 1943, constitute a unique source to understand the origins of Tanpınar's ideas of the novel, his interpretation of practice of writing since the Medieval Era in the East. These concise articles valuable to understand Tanpınar's perspective of the genre

[32] Memduh Şevket Esendal, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Resat Nuri Güntekin, and Tanpınar were among those writers whose novels reflected upon political ideologies.

In the first essay, Tanpınar comments on how and why the Eastern (novel) writing is different from that of the western. He criticizes early Ottoman novelist Ahmed Midhat Efendi (1844 – 1913) for taking too much from the West. For Tanpınar, Ahmed Midhat is more of "a novel reader than a novelist" as he irresponsibly takes from the West and tries to create the same in his novels. Thus, as Tanpınar puts it, Ahmet Mithat "imports from the West as if he were a custom officer without any tax responsibilities" because just as Namık Kemal (1840 – 1888), who produced the first ever Turkish novel *İntibah* (1876), Ahmet Midhat Efendi, too, lacks 'imagination' (*muhayyile*).[33] Tanpınar emphasizes that the genre of the novel is not born in Turkey, but comes from the West, replacing another tradition. In the same article, Tanpınar reflects upon the history of the novel around the world and argues that the novel today is the criticism of the novel of the past. For him, *Don Quixote* is the product of the replacement of a tradition by its criticism. In this case, the Middle Age could produce *Don Quixote* after a number of social changes and developments. This novel was a criticism of the Medieval Era and was the harbinger of the birth of a new mentality.

Tanpınar continues his analysis of the novel by commenting on its condition in the 1940s: "Dış âlemi aşağı yukarı fetheden roman, şimdi bir tarafıyle iç âlemimizin en gizli noktalarına, gayr-ı şuura ve rüyalara dönmüş bulunuyor. …Proust'un, Montherlant'ın, R. Martin du Gard'ın bugünkü İngiliz romancılarının dili artık Balzac'ın

[33] "Romana ve Romancıya Dair Notlar I" in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. 3rd Edition. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1992. p. 56 – 61. My trans.

dili değildir." [34] For Tanpınar, the Ottoman prose in 'the Muslim East' (*müslüman şark*) that preceded the novel did not contemplate upon human psychology and "introspection" (58). This negligence of Muslim circles is more restrictive and consequential than its attitude toward the depiction of human in structural and pictorial arts. The Christian world has the habit of self-questioning through the practice of 'confession' and this tradition of manners allows the modern western novel to express the individual's psychological world in a way that Eastern novel has yet to achieve because of the lack of such practice in Islam (59).

Tanpınar sees a dichotomy between the old[35] and modern modes of writing. The modern novel is about the individual. The old, heavily influenced by Islamic civilization and mysticism perspective, on the other hand, does not even consider the existence of individual freedom before fate. Although the practitioners of the old (poets, prose writers, and storytellers alike) [36] too had feelings and emotions toward life, their flaw was that they were closed to the rest of the world. Thus, they could not experiment what initial stages of modern (novel) writing offered to them. According to Tanpınar, the beginning of the Ottoman Turkish novel suffers from the absence of men and women not living together in social life. A community without women in it could not be complete because

---

[34] "The novel that conquered our outside world has now turned to the hidden parts of our inner world, to subconscious and to dreams. …The language of Proust, Montherlant, Martin du Gard and English writers of today is not that of Balzac anymore." Quoted in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* p. 57 – 58. My trans.

[35] With the category of "the old" Tanpınar refers to the Medieval writers and poets. In this sense, he does not specifically refers to 'novelists' due to the non-existence of the genre in the East; however, his category of 'the modern" in this article refers to novelists.

[36] According to Tanpınar, the only exception to this group of old writers was Fuzûlî and his *Layla and Majnun* (the sixteenth century). This work shows signs of inquiries to the human psychology and the individual's inner life. This is the reason that his contemporaries did not understand his approach to writing. See Tanpınar (1992).

whenever human a being is the subject, there is always a point when the matter becomes romantic love. Thus, because of the absence of women in the social sphere, representations of such love lacks genuine expressions.

In the second essay, Tanpınar focuses more on the issue of women. He argues that first examples of the Ottoman Turkish novel prove that their writers did not know the women they write about as their mothers, sisters, and wives. The women characters they have in their novels lack identities. During this period, female characters had to be a concubine, a member of a non-Muslim minority, or a relative; novelists could not create female characters outside of these. In Namık Kemal and Ahmet Mithat Efendi, a woman is almost like an abstract invention; like a symbol, she is either good or bad. These writers did not reflect upon individual struggles and differences of their female characters but left them as a representative of the collective group. According to Tanpınar, the lack of freedom of the writer's mind was causing this issue. The writer's mind was not free to roam around the individual realities and stories of the characters they produced. At the heart of all these insufficiencies that the old writers had, Tanpınar thinks, lays the absence of preceding sociological and cultural basis.

He goes on to compare eastern and western cultural characteristics of writing to explain further why the East lacked such basis. Western writers were heavily influenced by the art of painting. After medieval literature, writers discovered nature through paintings. French prose significantly benefited from the nineteenth-century criticism of painting. Major French writers, such as Gautier, Stendhal, Balzac, Zola, Mallarmé, and Valéry were either critics or practitioners painting or lived among painters. Their

writings, according to Tanpınar, carry the influence of such encounters and knowledge of the art of painting.[37] A similar influence of painting as well as classical music can be seen in English writers as well. The knowledge of music and painting informs and enriches their language and their writings to a significant degree. When they first imitated the Western novel, Ottoman Turkish writers did not have the informed and enriched language that Westerners had. What they had was the Ottoman miniature painting; however, it did not contain the same perspective of life and nature that Western painting had. Thus, although classical Turkish literature reflected upon all the aspects of miniature painting, it could not transcend its limits. According to Tanpınar, this constituted a great difference between eastern and western writings (Tanpınar 1992: 62 – 65).

In the third essay, Tanpınar focuses on the role of dialogues in the novel. After talking about how Dostoyevsky, Dickens, Balzac, and Stendhal use dialogue in their novels to create their characters, Tanpınar underlines that first Turkish novelists did not have dialogue in their works. Although some of them attempted to have dialogues among their characters, they ended up having dry, emotionless, and lifeless conversations that do not reflect the mind or psychology of the character because they were not able to enter into the minds of their characters.

---

[37] Tanpınar states: "Bütün bu saydığımız isimler, bu sevdikleri ve çok iyi tanıdıkları sanatın kazançlarını nesre taşıdılar. Balzac veya onun neslinin eserlerinde taklit edilen veya örnek alınan tablo, duvara asılmak için kendiliğinden sahifeden fırlayacak gibidir. O inceden inceye teferruat merakı, bitmek tükenmek bilmeyen portre, sonu gelmeyen rötuşlar, bir heyet-i umumiyeyi bir çizgide ihata etmek ister gibi uzayan cümleler, bütün bunlar resimden geliyordu" [All these names that we list here carried the knowledge and awards of the art of painting that they loved and knew very well into their prose. A painting that is imitated or taken as an example in Balzac's and his contemporeries' works is as if it would jump out of the page to be hung on the wall. That desire for in depth, exquisite details, that never ending painting, those endless retouchings, and those sentences that extend as if they were trying to mislead a general group; these all come from painting]. My trans. SeeTanpınar (1992).

Tanpınar's understanding of a real novelist is also based on this notion. He states "Bir şahsı konuşturabilmek için onun postuna girmek lâzımdır" (67), [To be able to make a character speak one needs to *become* that character]. In other words, a real novelist is the one who can enter into the mind of the character.[38] This mindset about novel writing and the history of Turkish novel informs Tanpınar's writing significantly. Tanpınar acknowledges that East and West have different literary traditions and cultural backgrounds, and their writings were informed by these backgrounds; thus, trying to write like western novelists by superficially imitating their linguistic or structural styles was destined to remain poorly constructed imitations. Therefore, he tries to avoid what, he thinks, his predecessors could not grasp and create what they lacked. In his novels, Tanpınar allows inner worlds of his characters to be seen. One sees the influence of Turkish classical music in *A Mind at Peace*. With his knowledge of western languages and literature and having seen the attempts of his predecessors to produce 'western novels,' Tanpınar succeeds in bringing out in his novels what belongs to his own culture.

When Pamuk is considered under the scope of a novelistic evaluation, his writing offers insights that further contribute to understanding the modern Turkish novel. He does not approve all the artistic, stylistic, or novelistic choices that Tanpınar made in his novels but, as one sees in a close analysis of Pamuk's novels, he makes a generous use of Tanpınar in various aspects.

---

[38] According to Tanpınar, neither Namık Kemal nor Midhat Efendi was able to make their characters talk. Hüseyin Rahmi (1864 – 1944) started the dialogue in novels in Turkish literature; however, he too fails to reflect upon the psychology of the individual.

Trying to evade all the non-literary connotations stuck to his name,[39] Pamuk puts his literary identity forward every chance he gets both through his books and other mediums through which he reaches his audience. He expresses his love for the art of novel in various interviews, talks and writings. For him, "novels are second lives" (Pamuk 2010: 1), and "the real pleasure of reading a novel starts with the ability to see the world not from the outside but through the eyes of the protagonists living in that world" (11). Pamuk claims that "a real novel" can take us into its own universe making us forget the reality of our lives.

The author's response to a question about the influence of the novel on Turkish literary traditions is quite telling about his questioning and understanding of the genre within the Turkish context: "…the Turkish novel has a hundred-and-fifty-year history – and then how European is the novel? How Western is the novel, and how non-Western is Turkey?" (Mirze 177). These questions come from a novelist whose predecessors in the nineteenth-century, when the novel was first translated and later written in Ottoman-Turkish, were more interested in how western the lifestyle presented in the novel, a genre imported from the West, was than the artistic opportunities that the genre could offer. Pamuk's criticism of such novels also differs from the pioneers of the genre in Ottoman Turkey.[40] Instead of being didactic, he uses a more complicated and allegorical method to express his political stand toward national ideologies in Turkey. However, while doing this, Pamuk creates an entirely different world in the novel that surpasses locality and

[39] Pamuk's literary reputation is further discussed in Chapter 4.

[40] One such example is *Araba Sevdası* (1889) by Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem. In this novel, the superficial imiattion of western lifestyle is openly criticized. This novel is considered one of the first examples of criticism for unexamined westernization in Turkey.

time. This makes an important statement about Pamuk's understanding of the genre: Novel writing is not merely a criticism or reflection on reality. Göknar interprets motivations behind the way Pamuk builds characters, who are "both orientalized and nationalized," just as Pamuk himself, due to "the cultural revolution" and his characters "question their imposed identities through transgressive acts of writing." In his book *Orhan Pamuk, Secularism, and Blasphemy*, Göknar argues:

> Pamuk's novels must grapple with two dominant aspects of Turkish secularization: the epistemic violence of the cultural revolution and the internalized orientalism of Kemalism and Turkism. Such interrogation leads his protagonists to try (by writing or painting, for example) other textual sites of identification and subject formation. These attempts fail within the confines of the novel's plot itself – where texts are incomplete, lost, hidden, or absent – but are redeemed by a writing process that transcends Republican suppressions. Pamuk turns the novel, ostensibly a vehicle of secular modernity … into a vehicle of narrative redemption that confronts secularism. (93)

Ironically, Pamuk aims to detach interpretation of the genre through national lenses and promotes thinking it simply as an artistic production. In his novelistic filtering, the novel should not be too political either, although the subtext of politics exists in all of his novels. However, what makes most of his novels successful includes that the underlying theme of politics does not surpass the artistic nature of his novels.

A paradoxical similarity between these two authors is that they both had similar motivations in mind. However, their target reader is different although they both manage

to appeal to the reader of world literature today. In his essay, "Kimin için Yazıyorsunuz?" [Who Are You Writing for?] (2010), Pamuk talks about how many times he heard this question throughout his career as a writer and its indications significantly changed in time. When a Turk asks this question, the answer expected from him, as Pamuk states, is "I am writing for the Turks" (205). According to the author, this national and ethnic expectation from the genre of novel is set when it first emerged in the nineteenth-century; when the novel was a national form of production. Writers like Balzac, Dickens, and Dostoyevsky wrote for their nations. Back then, the novel was supposed to be about the problems of the nation. Novel and nationalism emerged as cooperating forces.

With the influence of modernism, the first half of the twentieth-century began to treat the genre as a form of high art. In the last four decades, literary writers, such as Marquez, Coetzee, Paul Auster, have addressed literary novel readers around the world. In the past, national readers of Dickens were looking forward to reading his novels with nationalist notions, now people around the world wait with the same kind of enthusiasm for books written in the different parts of the world for the global reader. This notion marks one of the differences between Pamuk and Tanpınar. Today, world literature and postnational condition motivate writers. While Pamuk can be counted among such writers, Tanpınar cannot. Although Tanpınar would probably answer the question entitling Pamuk's essay as "I am writing for the Turks," one still cannot label Tanpınar as a nationalist writer. To explain their difference but also similar intentions in the novels, I quote from the essay quoted above:

> Yaratıcı romancıların tarihe ve milli sorunlara milli olmayan bir bakış açısından bakabilmeleri, milli kimlik, uluslararası temsil gibi konularda kendine güveni olmayan, tarihlerindeki karanlık noktalar ve kendi milli dertleriyle yüzleşmek istemeyen Batı dışı milli devletleri endişelendiriyor once. Yazarın milli okur için yazmadığı, demek ki "yabancılar" için konusunu egzotikleştirdiği ve aslında hiç varolmayan bazı sorunları uydurduğu ima ediliyor. (207)
>
> It worries the non-Western states first that do not want to face their own national problems and the dark realities in their histories; that do not have self-confidence in issues, such as national identity and international representation when creative novels look at national issues from a non-national perspective. It is implied that the writer is not writing for the national reader and thus, he exoticizes his topic for "foreigners" and he imagines a national problem that does not exist in reality. (my trans.)

Tanpınar was a novelist who wrote for Turkey, but, at the same time, he globalized national topics for a non-national tribute to the genre of novel. He was interested in serving the genre more than serving nationalist demands that the Republican government put on intellectuals. Pamuk, writing from a different historical point, could find appreciation in the world for his service to the genre. For Pamuk, writing only for one's own national reader is a disqualification for being a world novelist today because today the genre of novel is becoming a genre for a particularly distinguished reader, namely the global reader. In his article on Turkish novel, titled "Berna Moran Vesilesiyle Türk

Romanına Bir Bakış" in *Manzaradan Parçalar: Hayat, Sokaklar, Edebiyat*, Pamuk argues that:

> Roman artık, "bizlerin" hiç de denetiminde olmayan gelişmeler sonucu, milli dertleri, milli okur için, milli bir duyarlılıkla anlatan bir şey olmaktan çıkıyor. Roman her geçen gün "üst kültür" ürünü, "seçkinlerin" okuduğu bir sanat olmaya doğru evriliyor. Yalnızca yerel seçkinlere değil, dünyada roman okuyan sınırlı bir kesime seslenen sanat. (311)

> As a result of the developments that are not under our control, the novel is becoming something other than something that tells national problems for national readers. Each passing day, the novel is becoming a product of "high culture," an art that "the distinguished" reads. Art that addresses not only to the distinguished in the local but also to a small group that reads the novel in the world. (my trans.)

While Pamuk's interpretation of Tanpınar as a novelist implies that Tanpınar would not be able to address the 'small group' in the world, as his novels primarily address Turkish reader. The national topics that Tanpınar's characters deal with in his novels do convey transnational meanings on modernism, tradition, and national identity that not only Turkey but many other nations experienced throughout the twentieth century. Thus, the novels of both Pamuk and Tanpınar serve to similar concerns that readers around the world find appealing. What unites the two novelists is their differing approach to the genre of the novel.

The idea that Turkish writers began to practice modernist and innovative writing techniques only after the second half of the century, particularly in the 1970s[41] is difficult to defend. This claim fails to acknowledge how the writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century including Halid Ziya Uşaklıgil (1867–1945), Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar (1883–1963), Mehmet Rauf (1875–1931), Tarık Buğra (1918–1994), and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901–1962) received considerable criticism during their times mostly due to new literary techniques that they employed in their writings. They did not appeal to the readers of their times, just as many modernist writers of the world also did not. Pamuk's notions on Tanpınar and his literary modernism provide an example of the nature of Turkish literary modernism. Pamuk's evaluation of Tanpınar as a novelist furthers novelistic differences between the two while ironically they write about very similar issues. In an article he published in 1987, Pamuk appreciates Tanpınar's way of engaging the art of painting in his novel *Aydaki Kadın*[42] [The Woman in the Moon]:

> Değil yalnız Türk romanında, dünya romanında da resim sanatına ve ressamlara bu kadar çok gönderme yapılan başka bir romanın olduğunu hatırlamıyorum ben. Sanki modern Türk edebiyatının geçmiş kültüre en derin dikkati gösteren ve en "Batılı" yazan Tanpınar, geleneksel kültürümüzde eksikliğini hissettiğimiz resim ve seyretme zevkini romanının dünyasıyla doldurmak istemiştir. (qt. in Çağın 63)

---

[41] In her book *Orhan Pamuk'u Okumak*, Yıldız Ecevit argues that modernist writing started with the writers, such as Oğuz Atay, Orhan Pamuk, Leyla Erbil, Yusuf Atılgan, Ferit Edgü, Vüsat Bener, Latife Tekin, Güney Dal, Orhan Pamuk, Bilge Karasu, Nazlı Eray, Metin Kaçan, Hasan Ali Toptaş, Murathan Mungan, İhsan Oktay Anar, Adalet Ağaoğlu. Most of these writers started their writing career in the 1970s. See Ecevit (2008)

[42] *Aydaki Kadin* is an incomplete novel that is published for the first time in 1987 by Adam Press in Turkey.

> I do not know any other novel, not only in Turkish novel but the world novel as well, that alludes to the art of painting and painters as much as this novel does. As if Tanpınar, who pays a profound attention to the culture of Turkish literature, who is the most "western" Turkish writer, wanted to fulfill the lack that we have in our traditional culture toward the pleasure of painting and its observation through the world of his novel. (my trans)

In this article, Pamuk also states that Tanpınar shows the influence of *Ulysses* in his writing through examples of inner monolog and in the time of the story, which takes place within a day and is loaded with memories of the past. All these comments become relevant to *Peace* as well since *Peace* takes place in one day with flashbacks to the previous year, and is full of inner monologs of the protagonist. However, Pamuk's opinion about seeing Tanpınar as a modernist writer considerably changes during the years following the article quoted above.

In 1995, Pamuk published another article "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi" [Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Turkish Modernism]. In this article, Pamuk conflicts what he said about *Aydaki Kadın* eight years earlier and argues that in *Aydaki Kadın*, Tanpınar tried but failed to apply modernist writing techniques, such as humor and cynical attitudes and understood such techniques as ways to present and imitate life in a more realist way. Narrating life in a realist light, for Pamuk, is just the opposite of what modernist writing does to transcend conventional ways of writing. In the same article, Pamuk compares Tanpınar to Joyce again; this time, however, to support his argument by trying to show how different the two are. Further, Pamuk clearly states that

Tanpınar is *not* a modernist writer. For Pamuk, he is, in fact, just as any nineteenth-century writer, who looks for coherence in the world of his books, in fact, just "like Goethe." While commenting on *Peace* and how it is not a modernist novel, Pamuk points out Tanpınar's linguistic preferences like his use of the personal pronoun "we" to claim how such choices disqualify Tanpınar from being a modernist writer. Pamuk accepts that Tanpınar knew about modernist writers, but he was not one of them. For Pamuk, in most of his writings Tanpınar is like an "ideologist," and a teacher:

> Topluma karşı, toplumun ya da cemaatin temsil ettiği şeylere öfke duyan, toplumun dışında bir insan, bir "modernist" değil. Topluma duyduğu öfkeden ya da toplumun ona verdiği şeylere karşı duyduğu bir şiddetten, topluma karşı zor, anlaşılması güç bir metin yaratan birisi değil. Toplumla ilişkisi bir öğretmen ve ideolog ilişkisi. Ne yazık ki Ahmet Mithat Efendi gibi derleyici, toplayıcı bir çeşit ahlak ve kültür öğretmeni gibi bu satırlarda Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar.
> (Pamuk, "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" 39)

> A modernist is not a person who is against the society and who is frustrated with what the congregation [here congregation refers to the Islamists who were not happy with Ataturk's secularism and the Empire's fall merely for religious reasons] represents and he is not someone outside the society. He is not a person, who creates a text, which is difficult for the society to understand, because of his frustration toward the society for what the society presents him. Tanpınar's relationship with the society is that of a teacher and an ideologist. Unfortunately,

> in these lines of the book [*A Mind at Peace*], Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is like a totalizing and compiling teacher of culture and ethics just like Ahmet Mithat Efendi.[43] (my trans)

For Pamuk, it is not possible to understand Tanpınar by looking at modernism. Pamuk's claims seem to be based on a limited evaluation of only a limited number of Tanpınar's works and not on his complete oeuvre. Additionally, Pamuk accuses Tanpınar of using narrative innovations unprofessionally, such as intricate word plays, which confuse and surprise reader for not giving away their meanings easily are, in fact, similar to the techniques that Pamuk himself generously experiments in his novels. In this same article, Pamuk also tries to tell the story of Turkish modernism through Tanpınar.

It is true that in *Peace*, Tanpınar is often didactic when he conveys his message about his concern for the loss of the past. Using the pronoun "we," which bothers Pamuk and becomes the pillar of his claim, the narrator calls out to the reader through this example: "*Everything is subject to transformation; we can even foster such change through our own determination. What shouldn't change are the things that structure social life, that mark it with our own stamp*" (*Peace 22*). While it is questionable if such details would be enough to claim that Tanpınar is or is not a modernist, it is useful to

[43] Ahmet Mithad Efendi (1844 – 1913) was an Ottoman writer, translator and journalist of the Tanzimat period. He is known for his conservative ideas and didactic novels in which he invited his readers to be cautious about dangers of wrong westernization. Most of his works, particularly his novel *Felâtun Bey ile Râkım Efendi* (1875) is a good example for his comparison between Felâtun Bey, who practices westernization extremely superficially, and Râkım Effendi, who is the representation of moral behavior, and hard work ,who at the end of the novel succeeds in his endeavors while Felâtun Bey fails in whatever he tries to achieve. Thus, Pamuk's comparison between Tanpınar and Ahmet Mithat Efendi is significant. Translation is mine.

know Pamuk's opinion of Tanpınar to have a better understanding of the inner intricacies of modern Turkish literature.

In 2001, the hundredth birthday of Tanpınar was commemorated through various events. On December 22 of that year, Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet* published a page on Tanpınar titled: "Edebiyatımızın Usta Yazarı Doğumunun 100. Yıldönümünde Çeşitli Etkinliklerle Anılıyor. Saatler Tanpınar'a Ayarlı" [In His 100. Birthday, The Master Writer of Turkish Literature Is Commemorated with Various Events. The Clocks are Set to Tanpınar]. Pamuk wrote an article for this page titled "Doğu ile Batı Arasındaki Adam" [The Man Between East and West]. The title of the article, however, contradicts its positive implications, particularly in Turkish. Some of the implications would possibly allow readers to assume that Pamuk would talk about Tanpınar as a bridge between the two worlds, as he, in fact, previously stated in another article. However, this article mainly talks about how his novels and poems are inadequate in various ways. In her newspaper article, "Orhan Pamuk versus A.H. Tanpınar", Tatyana Moran, who was Tanpınar's student at Istanbul University and then became his close friend, criticizes Pamuk's criticism on Tanpınar and accuses him of being threatened by Tanpınar's recently resuscitated reputation:

> Tanpınar'ın yeniden parlayan şöhreti, onun şerefine düzenlenen etkinlikler, eski kitaplarıyla birlikte şimdiye kadar basılmamış olan notlarının basılmaya başlaması Pamuk'un her zaman 'Primus İnterpares' olma iddiasını rahatsız etmiş anlaşılan. Bu yazısıyla Pamuk, 'Primus İnterpares' olamama korkusuyla Tanpınar'ı sıfıra indirmeye çalışıyor. …Tanpınar'ın dünyasına girmek, onu anlamak kolay

değildir. Hele Orhan gibi 'humour'u olmayan, insanlık ilişkilerine değer vermeyen, derinliğine inemeyen bir yazar için imkânsızdır. [44]

> It seems like Pamuk's claim to be *primus inter pares* at all times is disturbed by Tanpınar's revived reputation, the events organized in honor of him, republication of his old books and publication of his so far unpublished writings. With this article [Pamuk's newspaper article], Pamuk is trying to diminish Tanpınar out of his fear of not being able to attain a *primus inter pares* position. …It is not easy to understand Tanpınar and go into his world. It is especially impossible for a writer like Orhan, who does not have a sense of humor, care for human relationships and is not able to explore depths. (my trans)

Tanpınar and his works have received substantial attention since the 1990s. This recognition generated dynamic discussions in literary circles in Turkey. New editions of Tanpınar's works are published, and Turkish readers began to read more of his works. Three of Tanpınar's students (Gözde Sağnak, Ali F. Karamanlıoglu, and Mehmed Çavuşoğlu) published the class notes that they took during Tanpınar's lessons at Istanbul University. *Edebiyat Dersleri* (2004) [Literature Lessons] sheds light upon Tanpınar as a professor of literature and clearly shows the comparative method of his teachings in literature. With the publication of Tanpınar's journals (*Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*) in 2007, Turkish readers further learned significant details about Tanpınar's

[44] Moran, Tatyana, "Orhan Pamuk versus A.H. Tanpınar" *Cumhuriyet Kitap* 636 (2002). December 20, 2013, www.cumhuriyetarsivi.com/reader/reader.xhtml.

personality and his private life that many ideas about the authors began to change by more informed opinions. A number of other books have been published during the last decade about the author. The recent increase in Tanpınar's life and works does not seem to be only local, though. In 2008, Tanpınar's seminal work *A Mind At Peace* was translated. Most recently, *The Time Regulation Institute* another novel by Tanpınar published among Penguin Classics series.

Pamuk's international reputation as a prolific Turkish author is followed by Tanpınar's resurrection as another author of Turkish literature. Moreover, the similarities mentioned above between the two have become a topic that literary critics in Turkey widely discuss. During this resurrection, Pamuk's thoughts on Tanpınar are both intriguing and evolving. In *Other Colors: Essays and a Story* (2007), Pamuk acknowledges Tanpınar's influence on his writing:

> In my opinion, the greatest Turkish writer of the twentieth century is Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Aside from his greatness is the fact that he's significant to me. Tanpınar both knew the Western culture, French poetry, and novels – for example, he admired Valéry and Gide – and he'd cultivated a deep relationship with traditional [Ottoman Turkish] poetry and music. The anguish that sustains all of his work arises from the disappearance of traditional artistry and lifestyles. … By situating his own guilt and silent *hüzün* between East and West, Tanpınar imbued his work with an extraordinary sense of real [circumstances]. Because his novels are fed by both worlds and because they embrace each in kind, they are profound, and that's the reason his protagonists are so conflicted. (166)

Pamuk clearly appreciates Tanpınar's knowledge of both worlds and thus, his being in a particularly strong position to interpret "the anguish" and reflect it on his writings as "conflicted" protagonists. Similarly, Pamuk manifests articulated forms of representing that anguish through his rather conflicted characters, such as the Venetian, Hodja, and the Murderer, in his novels. Nevertheless, Pamuk does not fully approve Tanpınar's works and contests the claims that acknowledge Tanpınar as a modernist writer of Turkey. Tanpınar's restlessness with attempted Turkish (literary) modernity translates into literary neo-Ottomanism in Pamuk's later novels, which I discuss in detail in Chapter IV. Pamuk's response to Tanpınar's authorship might be changing in time and such dynamic nature of criticism and evaluation is enriching for contemporary Turkish literature.

Both Tanpınar and Pamuk criticized Turkish nationalism and its influence on the novel from their historical standpoint after reflecting upon their own experience. Theories of nationalism and how they do not suffice to explain the case of Turkey make the unique role of these particular novels more influential. I comment on Turkey in the context of major theories of nationalism in the following section, which further explains the significance of Tanpınar's and Pamuk's cosmopolitan claims in the world literary space as representatives of Turkish literature. Ottoman cosmopolitanism and Turkish presence in the world literary scene as a culture with strong ties to a cosmopolitan past benefits from knowing how Turkish nationalism does not fit into any single theory of nationalism originated mainly in the West.

From Theories of Nationalism to Turkish Nationalism

"If the future remains uncertain, we know the past history of nationalism. And that should be sufficient to encourage a habit of watchful suspicion."
— Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism*

"Bu memleket tarihte Türktü, halde Türktür ve ebediyen Türk olarak yaşayacaktır."[45]

Atatürk, 1923

A single universal theory cannot exist for most social phenomena. This applies to the concept of nationalism, probably more than any other ideology. In *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction,* Umut Özkırımlı argues that "nationalism is a protean phenomenon, capable of taking on a multiplicity of forms depending on the – historical, social and political – context over which it reigns. This diversity precludes the possibility of formulating an 'overarching theory'" (226). The concept of nationalism must be used in plural, as there cannot be one single theory applicable to the nationalisms of all nations. The multiplicity of theories within the overarching context of nationalism is a manifestation for this claim. This is not to say, however, the study of nationalism cannot benefit from its theories, as Calhoun argues, "grasping nationalism in its multiplicity of forms requires multiple theories" (8). Rather, it may be more succinct that this section briefly examines major nationalism theories and try to locate Turkey within the scope of such theories. The main goal of this section is to provide more insight into Turkish nationalism by showing which elements of what theories can be applied to the

[45] Atatürk stated this in his address to Adana in 1923. "This country was Turkish in the past; it is Turkish in the present and it will be Turkish till the end of the time." June 23, 2014, www.istanbul.gov.tr/?pid=175. Translation is mine.

Turkish experience and which ones do not offer a useful perspective to understand the Turkish case. It argues that the connection of an international modernization with nationalism in Turkey is what makes the case of Turkey distinctive and thus, it proves ineffective to try to categorize the Turkish case under any single theory of nationalism. Finally, this section endeavors to function as foreknowledge to the analysis of the transition period of Turkey that constitutes the subtext of the case studies discussed in this project.

Theories of nationalism and academic discourse on nationalism have exponentially increased particularly since the 1980s[46] with seminal works, such as John Armstrong's *Nations Before Nationalism* (1982), Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983), Ernest Geller's *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition* (1986) and Anthony D. Smith's *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* and *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism* (1998) among many other books and journals[47] on the subject. Due to such substantial and comparative studies, the debates on nationalism evoke better understandings of the theories themselves. Nationalism often influences other fields of study, such as sociology, and history. As a result of these studies, the literature around nationalism has become more diversified than ever because theories of

---

[46] Although the study of nationalism became an academic subject during the 1920s and 1930s and pioneered primarily with the works of Hans Kohn's *The Idea of Nationalism* (1944) Louis Snyder's *The Meaning of Nationalism* (1954) and *The New Nationalism* (1968), Carleton Hayes' and E. H. Carr studies after the 1980s constitute the most prolific stage of research on nationalism.

[47] Some of the major journals on nationalism are *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism, Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, Nations and Nationalism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Politics, National Identities, Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*

nationalism, particularly from the post-1980s period, present considerable attempts to transcend previous ones and provide a divergent discourse. New methodological and analytic approaches and comparative studies have enriched, challenged and sometimes redefined categories, such as "nation," "national identity" and "nationalism." Recent scholarly theories in the field of nationalist studies have questioned the teleological understanding of state-sponsored nationalisms and official nationalist histories. Different theories of nationalism promote multiple definitions of the concept available at any one time and with varying definitions. Not surprisingly, prevailing definitions also change. Most of the studies agree that nationalism is one of the driving forces that have shaped the modern world. However, it should be studied in a larger context along with multiple theories that seek to explain it. Although it is not possible to review all the theories of nationalism within the scope of this project – neither is it the goal of this study – a brief review of major theories of nationalism significantly informs my analysis of Turkish nationalism. More importantly, in the light of these theories, the case of Turkey demonstrates that its specific experience of nationalism, which does not simply surrender to any single one of these theories to explain itself, has led its literature to explore its cosmopolitan non-nationalist past.

Contrary to the primordial view,[48] scholars like Ernest Gellner argues that nationalism is, in fact, "a very distinctive species of patriotism, and one which becomes pervasive and dominant only under certain conditions, which, in fact, prevail in the

[48] Primordial view of nationalism is considered the first paradigm of nationalism. According to this view, 'nationality' is a 'natural' part of men and nations have existed since primordial times. For details, see Özkırımlı (2000).

modern world, and nowhere else" (138). For this reason, nationalism is a modern phenomenon. Discussions on nationalism and its theories have introduced new phrases, such as 'the invention of tradition' and criticism of such phrases. The theories have further enriched the academic discourse of the topic. Hobsbawm posits that nations are the product of nationalism and nationalism is a political project that aims to create a nation state. According to Hobsbawm, traditions are invented, constructed and formally instituted to serve ideological aims (1-4).

In his seminal work *Imagined Communities* (1983), Benedict Anderson postulates that the origin of the modern nation emerged as a result of the decline of religious communities, a significant change in the conceptions of time and mass publication of printed material, "print-capitalism." Print-capitalism, according to Anderson, led to "rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and to relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways'; that is, in 'national' terms" (Anderson 36). Anderson argues how the novel is utilized as a tool to construct and legitimize national identities. It creates deep attachments "that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings" (Anderson 7). Therefore, nationhood is something that is constructed or invented because "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson 6). Unlike Anderson and Gellner, Adam Smith emphasized the notion of continuity. According to Smith, "modern nations simply extend, deepen, and streamline the ways in which members of *ethnie* associated and communicated" (*The*

Nation in History 62-63). Smith's *Theories of Nationalism* (1983) stands out among other works on nationalism as a source that comprehensively surveys the theories of nationalism, particularly during the period between 1945 to the late 1980s. Mainly with the influence of decolonization and the establishments of new states in Africa and Asia, this period constitutes the most prolific period of research on nationalism, which might be because of both its pervasiveness and its transnational inappropriateness to the world beyond Europe. Nationalism in the post-1980 period led authors like Pamuk to challenge nationalism as understood and practiced in Turkey.

The relationship between nationalism and modernism is useful to examine closely in a section on Turkish nationalism. In *Theories of Nationalism*, Anthony Smith draws the distinction between traditional and modern societies that modernization theories launch from. According to modernization process, the period of modernization followed three stages: tradition, transition, and modernity. These stages required a breakdown of the traditional in order to establish a new order of society. "Contemporary sociological theories of nationalism start from the notion of 'modernisation,'" notes Smith, and explains 'the functionalist perspective' on modernization before he underlines its flaws:

> To survive painful dislocation, societies must institutionalise new modes of fulfilling the principles and performing the functions with which earlier structures can no longer cope. The merit the title, a new 'society' must reconstitute itself in the image of the old. The baseline for the transition is provided by a stereotypical traditional community, the 'primitive' tribal society, and another stereotype of modernity, the nation-state of Western Europe and America. Mechanisms of

> reintegration and stabilization can ease and facilitate the transition; among them are collective ideologies like nationalism which spring up naturally in periods of social crisis, and appear meaningful and effective for the participants of the situation. (*Theories of Nationalism* 49-50)

According to this view, nationalism has a clear function: it helps create a national identity in a time of social, and political crisis through a transition. It becomes the source of motivation for people to bring forth their remonstrance and participate in the nation building process. Each of the theories of nationalism has valuable insights. However, the problem with them, as Smith also points out, is "their one-sided accentuation of a single condition, or set of conditions, as necessary or sufficient for all or most cases of 'nationalism'" (86). Most of these theories agree on the role of the intelligentsia for all kind of nationalisms. Smith calls the theories that make a direct connection between modernism and nationalism "modernisation theories" or "communications" (87). Communications in this context by which he means the process where the intelligentsia reaches out to the people to educate them and create "the new men."

This type of information, according to Smith, "opens up undreamt of vistas, subjects all ideas to the tests of reason and observation, and endows individuals with a new status and sense of identity. It replaces precedent and myth and custom by the habit of critical inquiry, technical efficiency, and professional expertise" (87-88). Because the ideas of the intelligentsia are borrowed from the West, "the story of 'modernisation' is, therefore, an account of the varieties of selective adaptation or imposition of Western beliefs and institutions in alien settings, Smith further argues (88). Although this kind of

"communication" attempted to be practiced by Turkish intelligentsia with their turn to Anatolia and the rise of the village novel, it failed in its attempt due to the inability of the intelligentsia to communicate with the Anatolians in a way in which they could understand each other.

The literature produced was in order to "educate" villagers and give them a new sense of identity that they claimed villagers shared with the intelligentsia only helped to highlight the disparities between the two groups. The intelligentsia could not identify with Anatolians for the lack of shared experiences that this kind of communication specifically aimed to underscore. Anatolians did not have the education of the intelligentsia, neither were they exposed to the Western culture as the latter. Moreover, they experienced the Turkish War of Independence exclusively different from the members of intelligentsia did. Thus, the theories that Smith groups together under the name of "modernisation theories" do not fully represent the Turkish case either. Indeed, there is little correlation found because the certain uniqueness of the Turkish case is conspicuously absent from some of the rivaling theories, at least, in terms of applicability with the purpose of this exegesis.

The precursor of communications theory is Daniel Lerner. In *The Passing of a Traditional Society* (1958), Lerner explains the three stages of modernisation and bases his theory of nationalism that Smith groups under the category of "modernisation theories" on a story of three characters from Balgat, a little village in Turkey (*Theories of Nationalism* 89-95). Ironically, Lerner thinks Turkey is a good example for his theory as Turkey experienced such a transition. However, what his theory does not mention is that

in Turkey such a transition did not occur smoothly – if took place at all – and it does not qualify for Lerner's presuppositions required for his theory. In the story, each character represents certain stages of the modernization process in Turkey: while the village Chief is "contended, paternal, loyal, military-minded, … the epitome of traditional Turkish values," the Grocer "restless heterodox, worldly, unsatisfied and alone" is the one "in mental transition" and the paradigm of the 'transitional man," as Smith defines it. The third character Tosun, on the other hand, is the man of modernity. According to Smith, Lerner's logic was quite evident:

> In Lerner's account, the three characters – the contented Chief, the restless and ambivalent Grocer, and the self-assured Tosun from the cosmopolitan city – represent three stages in an inevitable progression: namely, the global process of 'modernisation.' All societies, that is, must pass from a face-to-face, a traditional stage through an ambivalent, uncertain 'transition' to reach finally the plateau of the modern, 'participant' and national society and culture. (90)

According to Lerner's theory, modernization is an "end-state" of the process of transition toward the model of the West and nationalism is a "passing" experienced during this process. Thus, Lerner's theory is an archetypical example of functionalist theories concerning nationalism. Critics of Lerner's theory agree on certain aspects that are relevant when one considers the case of Turkey. Among those aspects that Smith mentions, the following ones, which Özkırımlı befittingly summarizes, inform how the functionalist approach does not provide an umbrella view that can be applied to all nations that experienced nationalism in their own way: A) "Functionalist theories cannot

explain the variety of historical responses to modernization." In the case of Turkey, secularism defined the framework in which nationalism was understood while in other nations, such as Russia the leading ideology of nationalism was altogether different. B) "There is a multitude of functions which it is suggested nationalism can serve … for some, … it helps modernization; for others, it helps maintain traditional identities" (Özkırımlı 50). Moreover, for the ones like Turkey, it can fail in both. Smith furthers his analysis of functionalist theory with a vital point: "Functionalists tend to simplify and reify their ideal-types of 'tradition' and 'modernity' and he adds that these "stereotypes" of tradition and modernity are "ethnocentric and crude" (Smith 50). As such ideal-types are based on "Western valuations" their application to different settings creates "confusion and misunderstanding" instead of any satisfactory analysis and explanation of the nationalisms of such contexts. Moreover, as the recent interest in the Ottoman past also manifests, some groups in Turkish intelligentsia contested the idea that the Ottoman was "primitive" and backward, as the Republican modernization process tended to define it. Eventually, using the Turkish case as a good example to support his theory becomes the very reason why I contest Lerner's theory.

Although the Republican attempt to modernize is reminiscent of Lerner's theory, the end result completely contradicts it. Indeed, the debate about what is progressive or retrograde fails to acknowledge the main problem of such a perspective. Only a self-aware historicism can address the Ottoman past. To praise or condemn it is to repeat not merely Western nationalism but also is a prejudicial approach, both positive and adverse.

Lacking applicable insight, these theories *per se* do not fully explain specific perceptions and applications of nationalism in modern Turkey – and many other examples from around the world as well – since most of them perceive "this variable and varied process [nationalism] as a fixed structure" (Köroğlu 31). I argue that different ideologies that were predominant in different periods of Ottoman Turkish and modern Turkish history, namely Ottomanism, Islamism, Panturkism, Secularism, Turkism, Modernism, and Westernism, were parts of the Turkish nationalism and nation building process. One, after all, cannot cavalierly discount the fact that the Anatolian region is one of the oldest places on earth inhabited by humans. Moreover, one cannot contend with the fact that what it means to be a Turk, ethnically, has changed multiple times in the history of humanity through numerous absorptions and Diasporas.

The ancient Hittites, for instance, may have very little in common in ethnic terms with that of the Ottomans. However, it could very likely be assumed that much of the customs and mannerisms have been passed down generationally for millennia. If not the Hittites, what relevance may exist between modern Turks and the relationship of a pre-Islamic Turkey, say, the connection that a Christianized Constantinople may have had during the Roman occupation in modern times? Each of these ideologies had their own understanding of nationalism and conceptions of nationhood that affected – either by way of contradiction or extension – at times, their successors, and at other occasions, each other since some of them existed simultaneously.

As my primary focus of investigation is twentieth-century Turkish nationalism, I do not examine Ottomanism, Islamism and Panturkism in great detail in this project,

except when it might prove some derivation or historicity that renders useful to this research. Each of these ideologies, however, aimed to create a sense of nationhood and maintain the unity of the Ottoman Empire, which consisted of multiple ethnicities. Paradoxically, all three of these nationalist ideologies emerged as a result of nationalist movements within the Empire that led to the emergence of individual nations that were once assimilated but had then separated from the Empire. The issue of nationalism gets even more complicated and thus requires multiple perspectives to explain it when modern Turkey is in question.

Various approaches challenge the assumed dichotomy between the traditional and the modern in the context of nationalism. One such approach is the history of the Young Turks (Jön Türkler). The Young Turks are considered the founders of the Turkish nationalist reform party "Committee of Union and Progress" (CUP) that challenged the absolute monarchy of the Ottoman Empire during the rule of Sultan Abdulhamid II at the beginning of the twentieth-century. They started The Second Constitutional Era in 1908, which reversed the Ottoman Constitution of 1876 and restored the parliament.[49] Zurcher argues that much of the Kemalist rhetoric in the early years of the Republic was also evident in the Young Turk revolution, which challenges the view on Atatürk's famous Nutuk (Speech) that he delivered in 1927. In the Speech, Atatürk outlined that the principles the Republic brings to the country, such as secularism, technology, and science; ideologies like positivism, nationalism, and a state-centered worldview are the

[49] For details on the two constitutional eras of Turkey, see Ahmad (1969) and Hanioğlu (1995).

very proof of the break with the Ottoman past. However, the generation of the reformist Young Turks also shared these views and promoted the same worldview and principles in the rhetoric of their movement during the final years of the Empire (Zurcher 136-150). Both the Young Turks and Kemalists believed in modernization through westernization and the necessity of a cultural revolution to be able to attain a functional nation building process. Thus, the assumed sharp cut between the modern and the traditional, regarding nationalism, is further blurred in the case of Turkey.

One of the major issues in Turkish nationalist historiography was the search for a genesis for the Turks. Republican Turks tried to locate an origin for themselves starting from the late nineteenth-century. Ironically, the first origin for the Ottomans was Ottomanism,[50] partly to challenge the destroying effect of newly established nation states becoming independent from the Empire. In early twentieth-century; however, Pan-Turkism (Turanism), and after that, Turkism[51] took its place. During the rise of Turkism, the origin was located outside the Ottomans, which for the first time brought a substantially different dimension to the issue. The Turkish patriot Tekin Alp argues for such an antiquity transcending the Ottomans in the history of *real* Turks. Alp states that

---

[50] Ottomanism, a concept developed before the Tanzimat Era of the Ottoman Empire, promoted the equality among the *millet*s under the Ottoman rule, meaning all ethnic and religious groups in the Empire could live together under the holistic identity of 'Ottoman.' *Millet* system allowed the Empire to govern different ethnic groups, languages, and religions that it embodied. The main characteristic of Ottomanism was to enforce that all millets were equal before the law.

[51] Beginning among the Crimean Turks in the late nineteenth century and continued during the early twentieth-century, Pan-Turkism promoted a political union with all Turkish-speaking peoples in the Ottoman Empire, Russia, China, and Afghanistan. Ziya Gökalp and Halide Edip Adıvar were two of the prominent supporters of the movement in its earlier days. In the 1920s and the 1930s, however, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's reforms shifted the emphasis from Pan-Turkism to Turkish nationalism (Turkism). The Young Turks, however, planted the seeds in the late nineteenth-century.

"… it was high time to make the whole world, and to begin with the Turks themselves, understand that Turkish history does not begin with Osman's tribe, but, in fact, twelve thousand years before Jesus Christ … The exploits of the Osmanlı Turks constitute merely one episode in the history of the Turkish nation which has founded several other empires" (qt. in Kedourie 210). Alp continues his attempt to locate the origin of the Turks in a pre-historic time to strengthen the idea that the Ottomans did not constitute Turks, but Turks constitute it. His arguments also serve to put the Turks in a superior position than the Europeans:

> Whilst the rest of humanity was living in caves, leading a most primitive life, the Turk had already in his motherland become civilized enough to know the use of wood and metal … At a time when the Turks had reached a high level of culture in their own motherland, the peoples of Europe were still in a savage stage and lived in complete ignorance (qt. in Kedourie 216 – 219).

According to Alp, Turks are superior to other Muslims and it is the Turks that advanced Islamic civilization (Kedourie 221). Experiencing a period of "decadence" after having been "subjugated by foreign cultures and moral forces" may explain the reason why some associate Turks with backwardness, why Turks attain their previous superiority thanks to Atatürk, who plays the role of the national hero in Alp's argument:

> [Atatürk] could not tolerate therefore this false conception of Turkish history which was current among some of the Turkish intellectuals … He was therefore taken it into his head to eliminate it by means of a revolutionary outburst which

would subject it to the same fate as the other misconceptions from which the Turkish people have suffered for centuries (Kedourie 211).

Alp's article shows that even the disownment of the Ottoman past differs among Turkish intellectuals. This kind of divergence within Turkish nationalism makes it considerably difficult to explain the Turkish case with a single theory. Özkırımlı describes different understandings of nationhood among various forms that existed in Turkey:

> In Turkey, … Islamists, secular Kemalists, ultra-nationalists and liberals have different conceptions of nationhood. While Kemalists opt for (or at least on the surface) a 'civic-territorial' national identity, ultra-nationalists deny any form of cultural pluralism, promoting instead the ethnic and cultural unity, even 'identity,' for all those living in Turkey. Liberals subscribe to Western models of nationhood, whereas leftists espouse anti-imperialist Third World nationalisms which are largely inimical to the West. In short, there is no 'one' Turkish nationalism; rather, there are Turkish nationalisms. This shows clearly that we are faced with heterogeneous objects of analysis (Calhoun 1997: 21). The differences among and within nationalisms cannot be embraced by a single Euclidean theory, however, comprehensive and sophisticated its premises are. (Özkırımlı 228)

This divergent nature of Turkish nationalism(s) elucidates how modern Turkish authors reflect upon the Ottoman past. Pamuk and Tanpınar manifest diverse perspectives toward the Turkish case when one examines their entire oeuvres. Although Tanpınar demonstrates a more steady ideological life, his attitude toward westernization and the Ottoman past manifests nuances. Pamuk's earlier works exhibit signs of secular Kemalist

perspective while his later works have a heavy influence of the Ottoman theme. The novel is the main genre where they reflect their political inclinations and understandings. The notions of nationhood, national identity, and nationalism have a direct relation to literary production in Turkey. Thus, heterogeneity rather than nationality seems to be forming the foundations for these authors, who have the awareness that all things are fundamentally perspectival rather than actual.

As also seen in other nationalisms, such as Russia that took place in Europe, Turkish nationalists used literature, particularly the novel, to create a sense of national belonging and identity in the new nation state.[52] The disavowing of the Ottoman identity has been a gloomy and contentious subject that authors of the twentieth-century tried to overcome in various ways. Many authors[53] who, in service of this purpose, tried to find a

---

[52] During a nation building process, many try to establish a belief regarding their origin and Turks are no exception. Republican Turks believed that they had to make a break with the Ottoman past and create a new identity for the 'modern' Turks. During the nation-building period in the Republican Turkey, some based the origin of the Turks in central Asia, and others located it in Anatolia. These kinds of searches were needed to define themselves and establish an identity for the Turks, which had to be separate from the Ottomans. Each understanding or approach to the issue had its own problematic. They did not avoid making the history serve their ideologies by distorting, or manipulating it, as it was considered justifiable when it was about the question of "essence," origin, or genesis. The most effective way to create such origins was to use literature. Literary works had archetypes that came up in novels: men, women, enemy, traitors, patriots etc. All these types change in each kind of novel, which has specific understanding/stories of genesis. For further discussion on the grand national narratives on the origin of the Turks, see Murat Belge *Genesis: Büyük Ulusal Anlatı ve Türklerin Kökeni* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008). Belge's book is distinctive in that it discusses the origin of Turks and literary works on the subject and questions what literary methods Turkish authors used to define their identity. What does it mean to be Ottoman or Turkish and how can one locate a beginning point in history for Turkish origin? After examining various works from the twentieth-century Turkish literature on the issue, Belge argues that this whole issue is, in fact, futile, as it is always distorted, arbitrarily created according to the beliefs, priorities and ideologies of the specific authors.

[53] During the 1930s and the 1940s, different approaches to the origin of the Turks found voice in the works of Halide Edip Adıvar, and Ziya Gokalp, who supported Central Asia (Turanism) notion. In the 1960s and 1970s, Kemal Tahir talks about the story of the foundation of the Ottoman Empire in his fairly xenophobic novel *Devlet Ana* (Mother State), (1971). Tağrık Buğra in his novel *Osmancık* (Little Osman), (1983) creates the Islamic-Turkish thesis and Erol Toy in *Azap Ortakları* (Torture Partners), (1973) responds to this thesis with a genesis located in Anatolia. There are real historical figures in these novels, but the

glorious origin that is only Turks' and from which they are created as 'Turks." National identity construction consisted a significant part of nation-building process through literature. The novel was greatly instrumental in constructing and spreading different notions of a proposed genesis. It allowed authors to unite the people of the Turkish Republic under the grand narratives of the new state. They provided their readers a sense of belonging with the constructed stories of the past, and proper archetypes for the good and the bad.[54] The tracing of the novel to its folk narrative and epic origins relocates the

---

authors recreate them; the figures are not identical with their real personalities. What is significant about these three novels is that they all start their stories of genesis from the Ottomans. However, they all choose a different historical moment for the origin of the Turks. Probably nothing could be a better proof for the argument that the story of genesis as a mere construction by the authors. It is not possible to answer the questions, such as "Who are we?" "Where do we come from?" However, the moment of the foundation is significant for the national ideology that the Turkish authors tried to build.

[54] Vladimir Propp is the founder of narratology. He detected the elements of folk tales. Although his formalist approach has its defects his notion of archetypes is useful for my argument on the fictional types in Turkish grand narratives. There is an archetype for the Turkish birth/origin narratives. One of the elements is to try to find the origin, genesis, and its exposition. The plot (the origin which makes Turks) "Turks," such as an honest poor young man as the protagonist who never gives up behaving morally and being ethical and get rewarded at the end) shows similar elements. This comes from the high quality of the genesis of the Turks. Although we answer the question "Who are we?" as "Ottomans," there should be a genesis an essence that makes Turks "Turks" and that comes *before* the Ottomans. This point is emphasized in many of the genesis novels. Another common element of the grand narrative is the enemy or the traitor who always spy against the country. They may be one of us, or a foreigner. For example, the traitors in the literary works of the Independence War have nothing positive about them. The female type is significant for her asexuality. Mother: mother state (*Devlet Ana*, also the title of Tahir's novel), Osmanlı Kadını [Ottoman woman] are the main two. This type of woman has a strong bond to her husband, father, and children and of course to her nation. She is completely asexual. She is the nurse during the war. She guarantees the continuation of the race. Thus, she is an important character in the genesis legend. The ideology is mainly masculine, and it can accommodate a woman only under such circumstances making her asexual, and defeminizing her. In order to be respected, a woman has to be asexual, or even manlike. Lover is often a source of frustration. In Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's works, a lover always equals to destruction, a danger against the holy war for the nation. If men follow their desires for their lovers, they are sure to lose the fight of their nation. Turkish-Muslim men do not know what to do in front of a woman, who enjoys sexuality. This type was present in Karaosmanoğlu's novel *Sodom ve Gomore* [Sodom and Gomorrah] with the main female character, Leyla. Having a lover from another nation often solves this problem because the Turkish nation cannot accommodate both the figure of the mother with such characteristics and a lover as such. If the woman is not Turkish, it is appropriate for her to enjoy sexuality. Also, in many such works foreign women are always desiring Turkish Muslim men and feel delighted if these men like them, and have sex with them. Moreover, there are narratives, which show foreign women who find salvation with Turkish men and convert to the "true" religion of Islam.

genre's genesis outside Europe, or at least on its edges. The considerable influence of folk narratives on early Turkish novels further contradicts the credibility of the mere imitation argument.

Defining Turkish identity has been a considerably complicated subject for Turkish intelligentsia throughout the twentieth-century and continues to be so today. It has been a persistent theme in modern Turkish literature, which consisted of contradicting ideas on the subject. Many Turkish authors struggled with the theory that suggests, or tries to construct a *pure* Turkish identity due to the inevitable influence of the cultural remnants of the multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman scholar Şerif Mardin argues:

> Even though modern Turkey has been built on the core component of the Ottoman Empire, the relationship of the Turks of the Turkish Republic to their Ottoman ancestry are complex. Turks in the Ottoman Empire did not emphasize their identity since the term 'Turk' was used to denote only one component of a multi-ethnic Empire. It is also difficult to state who would have been a 'real' Turk in the Empire. Should the Bosnian who had converted at an early age and entered state service, acquiring a mastery of the Turkish language and rising to be grand vizier, be taken to be more of a Turk than the Turcoman tribesman who had little role to play in the decision-making process of the Ottoman Empire? ("European Culture" 13)

Mardin points out that being a "Turk" was something not clearly defined even in the Ottoman society, which makes the definition of the modern Turk even more complicated. The multi-ethnic nature of the Ottoman society primarily identified themselves either as

Ottomans or Muslims. Thus, associating their identity as a "Turk" *per se* was not common. After the collapse of the Empire, the issue became even more intricate as the majority of the population first had to be introduced to the concept of being a Turk and not a Muslim, or Ottoman first. Tanpınar, Pamuk, and other contemporary Turkish authors take on the issue of cultural identity through the Ottoman past and present it to the world that had chosen to neglect to attend the Ottoman Empire in its cultural and literary accounts from an objective point of view.

The obsolete nature of the nationalism that the Turkish nation state tried to create is what Tanpınar mourned about; Pamuk, on the other hand, is able to go beyond such mourning. Turkey experienced the consequences of nationalism that was sweeping up the territories the Empire ruled. The loss of the Balkans prepared the Empire to enter World War I while the ideas of nationalism and nation-building gained momentum during the Turkish War of Independence in Anatolia. This time, however, the idea of nation-state began to be established. Nationalist politics had been influential even before the modern state. Ottoman propaganda for nationalism failed substantially compared to European nations, such as Germany and England, as the Ottomans did not have a modern sense of nationalism. The loss of the Balkans due to nationalism brought controversial notions about this ideology. By the time the Empire decided that nationalism should be the way they should follow, it was already the Republic, and the Empire had already collapsed.

Nation-building requires a considerable support from literature, media, newspapers, and authors. The main role of a literary person in a nation-building period is to unite the people of his country and lead them during wars. The need for authors is as

significant as the need for soldiers in nation building. Therefore, separating political nationalism from cultural nationalism is often not feasible. As Köroğlu argues in *Türk Edebiyatı ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı 1914-1918* [Turkish Literature and WWI 1914-1918] (2004), during 1914-1918, the Turkish authors did not have a hegemonic power that they can take as their basis, thus, they tried to understand and interpret things according to their individual ideologies or the ideologies of the groups that they belonged to. Thus, there was no national ideology to unite them all. In Ottoman-Turkey, there was not the strong propaganda as they had in Europe, but a struggle to create a national identity.

Each of the theories of nationalism might explain different nations and their experience. The Turkish case can also benefit from them only when a combination of some of them is applied, as similar to the model of modernity that is originated in and for Europe, nationalism theories do not entirely encapsulate the specific cultural and historical conditions that Turkey embodies. Consequently, the authors I examine show their understanding of nationalism through their writings.

Chapter 3

The Ambivalent Case of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's translated novels contribute to the recent interest in the Ottoman Empire by detailing the process of transition from the Empire to the Republic and its aftermath at the beginning of the twentieth-century in Turkey. While *A Mind at Peace* chronicles the transition from an individual's perspective that makes global readers of the novel question the Ottoman past and modern Turkish identity and realize the intricacy of the Turkish history, *The Time Regulation Institute* narrates the Turkish experience of modernism and poses it as a critique of European modernism. Thus, it allows *Time* to cross the borders of Turkish literature and present global readers a Turkish novel that is more about the phenomenon of modernity than about Turkish modernism. Similarly, while narrating the story of a Turkish individual and its struggle with the erasure of the Ottoman cultural past, *A Mind at Peace* speaks to the world reader about reading a novel that moves beyond its national borders and claims its cosmopolitan past in the space of world literature.

Erdağ Göknar states that Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is "one of the first authors to treat crises in Turkish secular modernity as productive paradoxes of literary modernity" (*Orhan Pamuk* 112). Tanpınar was a prolific Turkish novelist, a poet, an essayist, and a literary scholar. He worked as a professor of Ottoman and Turkish literature at Istanbul University, where he had also studied in the school of Liberal Arts. Tanpınar's writings were not fully appreciated during the 1940s when he was publishing his works. He is *rediscovered* in Turkey as well as in the Western world as an acclaimed author during the last two decades.

Most of the literature around Tanpınar describes him as one of the most prominent writers of modern Turkey and a pioneer in modern Turkish literature. He suffered from being in between the Ottoman past and modern Turkey while he was also upset about not being appreciated as a writer. Today, however, the question of how his authorship contributes to the status of Turkish literature in world literature gains relevance. Tanpınar's writing focuses on the continuity of time and history and transcendence of that time. This theme informs Tanpınar's role for the modern Turkish novel and its presentation to the world. Out of six novels and hundreds of essays, articles, and his recently published diary, only two novels are translated into other languages.[55] This study that primarily addresses a non-Turkish reader hopes to offer insights through a close analysis of the Turkish primary and secondary literature which allows non-Turkish

[55] There are also secondary literature on Tanpınar that are written in English and other languages in the form of dissertations, articles, reviews etc.

speaking readers to understand the richness of the body of literature in Turkish and promote further studies and translations.

Using and transcending the major literary criticism and positioning Tanpınar in a world literary context provides an insightful reading of Turkish literature through the author and contributes to the discussions about Turkey's situation in the world. This study is informed by the local literature on Tanpınar and aims to convey an analysis of it as well as transcend its limits through the discussion of the author's claim to be a part of world literature.

Those who are familiar with Pamuk's works would notice thematic similarities between the two writers. They both dwell upon the Ottoman past, cultural and national identity, East-West synthesis, and their characters' psychology. However, what makes a comparison between these two writers valuable is not only the similarities that have been extensively studied, but also differences in their handling similar themes and issues. Tanpınar and Pamuk are responding to the break with the Ottoman past from two significantly different chronological and historical positions. Tanpınar, who experienced both the Ottoman and Republican state, and who could speak and write both the Ottoman Turkish and modern Turkish in Latin script, experienced the break with the past in a traumatic way. Cultural consequences of the break with the Ottomans that Tanpınar foresaw consist the very experience that Pamuk had throughout the second half of the twentieth-century. Thus, Pamuk is not only in a different historical standpoint than Tanpınar but also in a different cultural context. Thus, his reflection on the Ottoman past

carries the experience of his own history while Tanpınar's observations are from the middle of the cultural crisis that Turkey was undergoing in the 1930s and 40s.

Knowing Tanpınar's philosophy on poetry is significant to analyze him as a novelist. "Antalyalı Genç Kıza Mektup"[56] [Letter to the Young Girl from Antalya] is a famous letter that Tanpınar wrote to a high school student in Antalya in 1960.[57] The letter helps understand Tanpınar both as a poet and as a novelist as it reveals personal details from Tanpınar's youth and his perspective on the art of poetry and fiction and shows his statements about how some major European writers and philosophers influenced his works. Tanpınar's description of nature in Antalya and other cities that he lived in – particularly Istanbul – affirms that his poetry reflects such impressions from his childhood. Becoming more familiar with Tanpınar's poems and novels allows one to understand how this almost three-page long letter is, in fact, a synopsis of Tanpınar's writing. On his notion of poetry, Tanpınar says:

> Asıl estetiğim Valery'yi tanıdıktan sonra (1928-1930) yıllarında teşekkül etti. Bu estetiği veya şiir anlayışını rüya kelimesi ve şuurlu çalışma fikirleri etrafında toplamak mümkündür. Yahut da musiki ve rüya, Valery'nin, "velev ki, rüyalarını yazmak isteyen adam bile azami şekilde uyanık olmalıdır," cümlesini, "en uyanık bir gayret ve çalışma ile dildeki bir rüya halini kurma," şeklinde değiştirin, benim şiir anlayışım çıkar.

---

[56] The letter is published in *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası* by Mehmet Kaplan in 1963.

[57] It has been recently discovered that Tanpınar sent the letter to a male student instead of a female student, as the Turkish title given to the document by Mehmet Kaplan, one of Tanpınar's students, indicates. The manuscript of the response to Tanpınar's letter is found among Tanpınar's inheritance by Turkish writer Handan İnci. The addressee of the letter was a man, named Mustafa Erol.

> My real aesthetic taste was formed during 1928–1930 after I met Valéry. This kind of aesthetic or understanding of poetry can be formed around the word dream, or conscious ideas of working, or the classical Turkish music and dream. Change Valéry's statement, "even the person who wants to write down his dreams has to be fully awake" into "creating the dream-like state in the language with a fully awake effort and hard work" and you would have my understanding of poetry. (qt. in Kaplan 175, my trans.)

Although I do not examine Tanpınar's poetry in this study, understanding his philosophy of poetry reveals his approach to the genre of novel to a considerable degree. After giving more details about his poetic philosophy in the same letter quoted above, Tanpınar states the close correlation between his novels and poems and how his poetic philosophy explains his novels:

> Şiir hakkında bu tarz düşünen, onu sonunda insandan ayıran bir adamın niçin roman yazdığını şimdi bana sorabilirsiniz. O zaman size derim ki, şiir, söylemekten ziyade bir susma işidir. İşte o sustuğum şeyleri hikaye ve romanlarımda anlatırım. Onun için mümkün olduğu kadar kapalı alemler olmasını istediğim şiirlerimin anahtarlarını roman ve hikayelerim verir.
>
> Now, you can ask me why a man who thinks in this way about poetry, who separates poetry from man, writes novels. Then, I would tell you that poetry is more of being quiet. Behold, in my novels, I say those things, which I am quiet

about in my poetry. Therefore, my novels and short stories give the key to my poems, which I want to create as closed worlds as much as I can[58]

Tanpınar perceived poetry as a higher form of writing. The fact that he does not have as many poems as his writings in different genres reinforces the ultimate care that he claimed to give when he was writing poetry. Through his admiration for the poet Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, who was Tanpınar's professor at Istanbul University, and who wrote only a few poems spending decades on each to achieve perfection in his poetry, Tanpınar followed Beyatlı's poetic as well as political philosophy.[59]

The Melancholia of the Past: *A Mind at Peace*

As an ardent reader of western philosophy, Tanpınar was familiar with the works of French philosopher Henri-Louis Bergson. Bergson's perception of time and history impacted Tanpınar's understanding of these concepts, which the former used in *The Time*. In "Antalya'lı Genç Kıza Mektup,"[60] Tanpınar openly admits Bergson's influence: "Şiir ve sanat anlayışımda Bergson'un zaman telakkisinin mühim bir yeri vardır. Pek az okumakla beraber o da borçlu olduğum insanlardandır. [In my understanding of poetry and art, Bergson's concept of time has a significant place. Although I didn't read him extensively, he is one of those people that I am indebted to.]"

---

[58] Ibid., 175. Translation is mine.

[59] For Yahya Kemal Beyatlı's (1884 – 1958), a continuation of the past is necessary in the Turkish nation state. Istanbul takes a significant place in his poetry. For him, Istanbul's multi-linguistic and multinational cultural past is the most suitable place for the new nation. He substantially influenced Tanpınar's intellectual growth. Critics often attribute the character İhsan in Tanpınar's *Peace* to Beyatlı.

[60] This is an actual letter that Tanpınar wrote to a high school student. In the letter, Tanpınar talks about anecdotes from his life, his influence, and his philosophy of literature.

In his famous essay "Introduction to Metaphysics," and later in *Time and Free Will* (1960), Bergson explains his concept of duration (*la durée*), a theory of time and consciousness. "The two fundamental characteristics of duration" are "continuity and heterogeneity" (Deleuze 37). Bergson develops his concept of duration to memory and freedom. For him, the duration can be explained through memory in two ways: "the conservation and preservation of the past in the present" (Bergson, 1920: 8). Bergson characterizes consciousness as "before everything else, [as] memory" (*Mind Energy* 7). He further argues that:

> …there is no consciousness without memory, no continuation of a state without the addition, to the present feeling, of the memory of the past moments. That is what duration consists of. Inner duration is the continuous life of a memory which prolongs the past into the present, whether the present distinctly contains the ever-growing image of the past, or whether, by its continual changing of quality, it attests rather an increasingly heavy burden dragged along behind the older one grows. Without that survival of the past in the present, there would be no duration but only instantaneity. (*The Creative Mind* 211)

Bergson thinks that memory consists of consciousness and the opposite is also true. However, this does not mean that the memory of the past is identical because "our past follows us, becoming larger and larger with the present it picks up on its way; and consciousness means memory" (193). According to Bergson, then, the present is possible with the consciousness of the past. The continuity of the past is maintained by such consciousness in the present. However, as he also underlines, "the consciousness which

will accompany this feeling [Bergson does not name the feeling he refers here but says: "take for example the simplest meaning"]. It will not be able to remain identical with itself for two consecutive moments, since the following moment always contains, over and above the preceding one, the memory the latter has left it" (193).

Bergson's *durée* is, however, more than simply continuity. Duration has the qualities of heterogeneity and becomingness in addition to its continuousness. The non-linear model of time that Bergson describes explains Tanpınar efforts to continue with the qualities of the past by synthesizing the present – thus, attain heterogeneity – to *become*. Thus, Tanpınar's use of Bergson's theory of time emphasizes how in the space of duration many things happen, and there is continuous change that is in the process of becoming. Heterogeneity is, thus, a part of the becoming since change comes in many forms, especially in the case of Turkish transition to modernism from a multicultural and cosmopolitan culture. The notion of *durée* underpins Tanpınar's works; this is visible particularly in *Peace*.

Set in Istanbul in 1939, *A Mind at Peace* (*Peace*) was first serialized in the Turkish daily newspaper *Cumhuriyet* [Republic], published as a book in 1949, and translated into English by Erdağ Göknar in 2008. Described as "a magnum opus, a Turkish *Ulysses* and a lyrical homage to Istanbul" by its American publication house, which describes itself as "a nonprofit press devoted to contemporary and classic international literature,"[61] *Peace* is a seminal work of modern Turkish literature primarily

[61] December 12, 2013, archipelagobooks.org/book/a-mind-at-peace/.

for two reasons. Firstly, the novel is rediscovered when it was republished in the 1990s within the context of a growing interest in the Ottoman world. This chronological anomaly furthered discussions on Turkish modernism. While the seemingly unorthodox writings of Pamuk that shattered the preconceptions of the majority of the readers in Turkey about the Ottomans in the late 1990s, readers were baffled that Tanpınar had anticipated the issues that Turkish modernism would create almost six decades before such issues began to occur. Secondly, his novels are among the very few Turkish works, written and set in its historical period and translated into English in the twenty-first century when Turkish literature is emerging on the world scene. Göknar acknowledges the significance of reading Tanpınar outside Turkey as follows:

> *A Mind at Peace* explores the remnants of continuity with Ottoman modernization from a destitute, interwar Istanbul on the margins of the nation-state. …These remnants of continuity consist of an entire history of Ottoman modernization and cultural history (including music, architecture, and literature) stretching back to the early nineteenth-century reigns of Sultan Selim III and Sultan Mahmud II, who are considered to be the first modernizing sultans under the influence of the French revolution. (*Orhan Pamuk* 114)

Tanpınar promoted the idea of cultural synthesis between the Ottoman past and Western modernity in order to attain the 'New Life,' which is saturated in the culture of the past and transformed into the modern of the West. This, however, creates a struggle with Republican notion of the Ottoman past as being backward and anti-modern. Tanpınar puts considerable effort into creating a tone to merge the past with the present in his

novel. This kind of synthesis, in fact, guides Tanpınar's perspective throughout his life. Throughout the novel, Tanpınar tries to connect the cultural elements of the Ottoman East and European West in his protagonist, Mümtaz. Mümtaz is an orphan, who is raised by his cousin İhsan, a father-like figure and a role model in his life. He is educated in the French Galatasaray lycée in Istanbul and is familiar with European authors thanks to İhsan, who is an intellectual. Mümtaz embodies many of İhsan's ideas and at points, he thinks he is speaking out İhsan's ideas, rather than his own.

The novel is divided into four main sections named after the main characters of the novel (İhsan, Nuran, Suad, Mümtaz). The first part of the first chapter, "City of Two Continents, 1939," sets the tone for the whole novel by revealing İhsan's illness that might soon kill him and a gloomy Istanbul at the imminence of the World War II. In this chapter, Istanbul is a city torn between the old and the new world. The thought of the war is in the background throughout the novel, as Mümtaz contemplates "…he was convinced of the imminence of war. …[he] now added the bitter prediction of a poet he quite admired: 'This is the end of Europe'"(*Peace* 20).

It is ironic that the book is titled as *A Mind at Peace* (and *Huzur* in Turkish, meaning peacefulness and tranquility) as the whole novel carries this gloomy tone and blends it with a longing for the past. The new order of the Republic brings along a critical identity problem for the culture and its individuals. The protagonist is unable to establish his identity in the new order of the new state. The novel begins with the memory of the murder of Mümtaz's father when Mümtaz was still a little boy "in the early 1920s, on the night of invasion of S., a local Anatolian Greek, an adversary of the owner of the

house…" who "mistakenly shot his father" (*Peace* 24) and the mental image of " a grave dug under a sprawling *Platanus orientalis* in a corner of the yard," (25) or the memory of his escape from the village with his mom after his father's death. Soon after this, his mother also dies. İhsan's illness adds to the bleak tone of the novel even further, as İhsan becomes like a father for Mümtaz over the years they lived together.[62] Wherever he goes, he carries *hüzün*[63] within him. The third person narrator tells us: "Here [in İzmir], too, dwelled a residue of torments that didn't fit into his childhood imagination; here, too, gathered death, exile, blood, seclusion, and *hüzün*, the Hydra-headed dragon of melancholy coiling within him" (39), underlining the theme of *huzün* in the novel.

As I discuss later in this chapter, Tanpınar's familiarity with Freud's works is also illustrated through Mümtaz. Mümtaz suffers from childhood trauma for the rest of his life. "Like a figure in a novel, he'd confronted tragedy at a young age, ensuring that its effects would always afflict him" (45). After he loses his mother, he arrives at "Allied-occupied Istanbul" to live with his cousin İhsan and his wife. İhsan's role in Mümtaz's life is a particularly interesting one from the very fist day when İhsan greets Mümtaz by saying "Don't be so long in the face, son, forget about everything" (41). Downcast by İhsan's illness, Mümtaz remembers the love of his life that he could not marry. The

---

[62] For Mümtaz, İhsan is highly significant; he is a "surrogate father." "İhsan's influence over me is immense. He's my true mentor. Thanks to him, I was spared such unnecessary intellectual exhaustion" (*Peace* 216). What İhsan is to Mümtaz in Peace is often considered an allusion to the relationship between Tanpınar and Yahya Kemal Beyatlı (1884 – 1958), the Turkish poet, author and a politician. Tanpınar called Beyatlı his teacher and mentor. Creating a similar relationship between İhsan and Mümtaz, Tanpınar seems to be paying tribute to his mentor through his novel.

[63] *Hüzün* elaborates on this Turkish term in his book *Istanbul: Memories and the City* (2005) commenting on its acquired meaning in modern Turkish, which features a similar meaning to melancholia.

suicide of Nuran's lover Suad renders their marriage impossible and Mümtaz is never able to reunite with Nuran. Tanpınar seems to tell a love story with an unhappy ending if the plot of the novel is simply summarized. However, the story that I focus here is not the love story the plot seems to narrate. The novel is set in a culturally chaotic period in Turkish history. Thus, the rapid erasure of the Ottoman culture is the underlying pattern that Tanpınar weaves into the novel. In the story, Nuran becomes the personification of the disappearing Ottoman cultural past that Mümtaz longs for and their love story is a reflection on the same cultural past, which he will never unite again.

Afflicted with the loss of his happiness, Mümtaz feels melancholic about the disappearance of the Ottoman culture from people's lives day by day and the immediate fear from World War II. *Hüzün* casts a shadow on Mümtaz's life. He sees Nuran as a personification of the lost past. He does not have any ways to resurrect the past. Thus, "he tried to distance from those days, days to which it was impossible to return" (78).

The historical context of the novel occurs in the immediacy of World War II. With the experience of World War I and the expectation of World War II, as "headlines announced a tense state of foreign affairs"(23), Republican and modernist promise for a new and better world leads the individual to a mental state where he is pessimistic and concerned about what the future might hold. *Peace* conveys this anxiety mainly through its protagonist, Mümtaz. The global warfare impacts the circuits of literary modernism. The aftermath of WWII is often connected with post-modernism, a literary period that Tanpınar seems to indicate in this novel while Pamuk illustrates five decades later.

In *Peace*, the depiction of houses contributes to the general tone of the novel that anticipates the war. "He plodded through decrepit, grim neighborhoods, passing before aged houses whose bleakness gave them a semblance of human faces. Throngs surrounded him wearing expressions forlorn and sickly. They were all downcast, anticipating what the impending apocalypse of tomorrow held in store" (23). The sense of immediacy of the war accurately depicts the daily picture of Istanbul before and during the war when economic and social conditions deteriorated, and the pressure of the war influenced all aspects of life (Uğurlu 1741-2). The novel presents a narrative of the 1930s in Istanbul. Reading it almost a century later allows reinterpreting the time of transition in Turkish history and its reflection on literature showing the reader the intricacy of the period both to the local and the global reader of world literature.

Each character in the novel helps the reader see the cultural and intellectual context in Turkey at the time. İhsan, a high school teacher in the French lycée, Galatasaray, in Istanbul, is a Turkish intellectual. He lived in Paris for years and has comprehensive knowledge of French as well as Ottoman Turkish culture and literature. The time he returns to Turkey is when the country experiences ardent nationalism, which causes İhsan to "abruptly [change] his tune upon returning to Istanbul during the Balkan Wars" (*Peace* 216). Such ideologies affect intellectuals, and the novel depicts this through İhsan in the aftermath of his return to the country:

> He'd lived out many trends, witnessed the birth of various theories, and participated in the roaring harvest fires of aesthetic debates. Later, after he'd returned to Istanbul, he'd abruptly forsaken it all, even the poets he loved the

> most. In an unanticipated way, he only occupied himself with topics pertaining to the Turks, cultivating this interest to the exclusion of others. Since he'd developed the measure of his aesthetics sense in Europe, he didn't particularly distinguish local choices in the art from others. He introduced Mümtaz to the works of Ottoman poets like Bâki, Nef'î, Nâilî, Nedim and Shaykh Galip, along with musicians like Dede and Itrî. (45)

İhsan introduces Mümtaz to an intellectual life and affects his thoughts deeply. "His first books came to him from its [İhsan's library's] shelves. Novels, stories, and poetry – whose meanings he couldn't quite decipher – were his truest friends that initial year" (*Peace* 42). When he was seventeen-year-old, Mümtaz already "read the classical Ottoman divan collections and had savored the delicacies of history" and "it was İhsan who handed [Mümtaz] a copy of Baudelaire" (43 – 45). Tanpınar depicts Mümtaz's education in a blend of Ottoman and Western sources. Mümtaz becomes an ideal Turkish intellectual who is familiar with both western and eastern culture and literature; who is attached to his roots but can make an informed use of western culture, as well. Mümtaz tries to find a solution for a cultural crisis an intellectual like himself experience during the 1930s in Turkey. He attempts to find a synthesis between supposedly opposite paradigms of cultures. Acknowledging the in-betweenness of the individual from modern Turkey, Mümtaz represents an earlier version of Pamuk's characters like Hodja, who, although set in seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire, is an allegory of the modern Turk, who has embodied this identity question.

Through the story of Mümtaz, the novel problematizes Republican narrative of the history of Turks, which made up stories of the origin of the Turks and located the origin in the Asia Minor to differentiate modern Turkish identity from the Ottomans'. İhsan's understanding of Turkish history starts with the Ottomans and continues to the days of the Republic without a break. According to him, the art and culture of the Ottomans carry great value for writing such a historical account:

> İhsan aspired to write a comprehensive history of the Turks. … [he] advocated a chronological history. Beginning with the economic conditions the Ottoman Empire had inherited from the Byzantines, and proceeding year by year, he'd continue up to the present. Conversely, one might write up a sequence of great events; however, this wouldn't constitute a collection of comprehensive surveys as İhsan desired… Mümtaz would help with the project; specifically, he was to prepare the art and intellectual history sections. …Mümtaz's inclinations drew him toward poetry and aesthetics. …By and by he'd discovered the French poet Régnier, and through each of them a new horizon opened before him. (44)

Tanpınar emphasizes the significance of Ottoman history and indicates how it is in connection with western culture. The passage starts with the structure of the book that İhsan wants to write and ends with Mümtaz's admiration for the French poets. İhsan's "history of the Turks" is not simply "a sequence of great events." One sees how Tanpınar disfavors ultimate glorification of the imperial history and shows that they need to accept the flaws of their past and it does not mean to disown it. This philosophy that Tanpınar attributes to İhsan reflects his own political and intellectual approach to Turkish history.

As Mümtaz strides through the streets of Istanbul where he sees the remnants of the Ottoman past in every corner, he contemplates upon the loss of the past and the current condition of the city in a desperate state of mind. This observation becomes analogous of the whole nation for Mümtaz as well as Tanpınar that the reader sees throughout the novel. "Upon stepping outside, Mümtaz stared at the streets as if he were observing it in the wake of a long absence. At the entrance to the mosque opposite the house, …*Just the way I sat and thought twenty years ago*. … *but back then the mosque wasn't in this condition.* He contemplated his thought remorsefully. *Neither was the neighborhood"* (19). Mümtaz's sadness for cultural as well as physical changes in his world since the fall of the Empire is blended in almost every page of the novel reinforcing the irony of the novel's title.

Tanpınar's primary writing character in this novel is Mümtaz. The constant struggle he is having with himself illustrates a writer who is suffering from a writer's block. "İhsan, this summer I can't avoid the libraries. I have to finish the first volume no matter what!" says Mümtaz. The narrator explains how Mümtaz felt about his writing as pieces that cannot get together to create a whole: "The first volume… before his very eyes Mümtaz saw pages crisscrossed with threads of writing: annotations in crimson ink, extensive marginalia, and scratched-out lines that resembled an argument with himself. Who knew, maybe the book would never be completed" (20-21). Apart from the encyclopedia that they want to compose, Mümtaz also tries to write a historical novel on

"Shaykh Galip."[64] "This historical novel, set during the turn of the eighteenth-century era of Selim III, harbored elements of Mümtaz's own life. With Nuran in mind, Mümtaz had sketched the characters of Selim III's half-sister, Hatice Sultana, and his younger sister, Beyhan Sultana. …In one you're with Antoine Ignace Melling; in the other you're with Shaykh Galip…" (195-6). Tanpınar identifies Nuran with the identity of the past. The novel, however, is "Mümtaz's unfinished song" (196). Through Mümtaz's inability to produce the novel, Tanpınar indicates how difficult it was to write during this period for a Turkish intellectual. Facing the constant fear of losing the culture of the past, the writer experiences a mental perplexity in any attempt to document the past. Critical of the nationalist literary production of the period, which produced propagandist works serving to the ideologies of the Republic, Tanpınar emphasizes the inability to write about the past. Both the historical account Mümtaz and İhsan wants to write, and the historical novel Mümtaz aims to document the knowledge of the past that is systematically being erased.

As previously explained in the section, "From Theories of Nationalism to Turkish Nationalism," different theories of nationalism do not fully represent specific experiences of nation building processes in different nations. In the same section, I emphasize that literature plays a significant part in nation building processes building upon Anderson's theory of nationalism, which has its flaws as well as strengths. The part where Anderson argues that literature is formational in nation building processes applies to the case of

[64] Shayk Galip was an eighteenth-century Ottoman poet from Istanbul. He was also a member of the Mevlevi order.

Turkey. During the foundational years of the Republic when the supported state secularism and nationalism; intellectuals, such as Ziya Gökalp, Yusuf Akçura, and Ömer Seyfettin preferred to write in a didactic way that promoted Republican reforms, Turkey as a nation state and conceptualizations and applications of westernization.[65]

During his time, Tanpınar contributes to the nation building process in his own way through his novels and non-fiction writings. He seems to be speaking to his reader about how he sees the role of literature as an important component in the process and nation building. The novel also functions as the space where Tanpınar discusses the situation of the genre of the novel in Turkey during the 1930s. While the history of the novel was still new in the 1930s, Tanpınar reveals his concerns about the genre, its practice, and its function in the case of Turkey. Modernist novel, and the constant efforts of nationalist authors to produce nationalist novels are criticized through Mümtaz's words:

> …he thought about his historical novel on Shaykh Galip. The outline or the sections he'd written hadn't satisfied him. …There are too many digressions. I don't want it to be that way. …I sensed the need for a kind of organization beyond the synthesis of an ordinary plot structure. Does a novel have to start at one point and end at another? Do the characters have to move rigidly like

[65] It is important to note that the notion of westernization was also divided within Turkey. While some groups believed in absolute westernization, others used caution and supported a 'partial westernization.' Some of these authors quoted in this text criticized unexamined westernization that some groups started to adopt in the country. For authors like, Ömer Seyfettin it was important to stay purely Turkish in culture and in language. His description of Turkishness included neither westernization nor Ottoman traditions. These writers, too, nuanced among one another in terms of their ideological approaches to the nation building process of Turkey.

> locomotives on fixed rails? Maybe it's sufficient if the story line takes life itself as a framework, gathering it around a few characters. It's enough if Shaykh Galip appears in this framework amid these people through the effects of his outlook and a few biographical scenes… Under one condition… The narrative should describe Turks and the context of modernity. (213)

For Mümtaz, the novel should describe "Turks," just as Republicans aimed to use it for, however, different from the Republicans, Mümtaz's description of the history of Turks would include the past and the Turkish transition to modernity. This, for Mümtaz, would narrate the actual story of the Turks. Although Tanpınar seemingly wants to follow the Republican metanarrative for the history of Turks, he considerably diverges from the state's goal to create a history that does not include the Ottoman past. In the above quote, Mümtaz indicates that the modernist novel as prescribed by the West, with its inventions and twists in narrative structure, is what his writing subject is seeking. The traditional plot structure does not satisfy Mümtaz. His attempts to write the story of Turks in a modernist novel present a struggle for Mümtaz, as it did for other Turkish authors of the time, including Tanpınar.

In the novel, Tanpınar includes various elements of the Ottoman culture to reflect upon his appreciation. Architecture is one of the most significant elements of that culture for the writer. The representations of Ottoman style architecture are often used in Turkish literature as a metaphor to compare the old days of the Empire to buildings with a modern

style that began to be built in the aftermath of the foundation of the Republic.[66] Tanpınar is one of the first authors who helped set such a metaphor.[67] He describes houses built during the Empire in Istanbul as "…Remnants of Life" (145). Mümtaz's strolling in the city is when he reflects upon the architecture left from the days of the Empire as a way to commemorate the by-gone days. In such descriptions, Tanpınar conveys how significant architecture was for the Ottoman culture. "The wooden house had been built by who knows which wealthy Ottoman bureaucrat, finance minister, or provincial governor when marrying off his daughter. Despite its faded exterior paint, the elegance of its construction was still evident through meticulously carved window casings, oriel windows, and eaves" (21). The exquisite details of Ottoman houses exist as solid remnants of the past that the modern left to fade away. Mümtaz stands as someone who still appreciates the "elegance" of the past reflected in architecture through unique details, such as "meticulously carved window casings."

Nuran and Mümtaz's love story, "the simplest love story every told," as the narrator tells the reader at the beginning of the Nuran chapter, a seemingly central idea of the novel. Tanpınar, however, utilizes their love story to build a much larger theme about the condition of the country and the issues that intellectuals of the time experienced. Mümtaz's lover, Nuran, is more independent than most women of the 1930s. As the narrator's flashbacks to the summer time suggest, the longing that Mümtaz feels for the

---

[66] For a detailed study on the architectural rebuilding of Turkey after the Republic within larger social, political and cultural context of the country's attempts to become a modern nation, see Bozdoğan and Akcan (2013).

[67] Tanpınar uses this metaphor in some of his shorts stories, such as *Acıbademdeki Köşk* (1949) and *Yaz Yağmuru* (1955).

by-gone days of the past and particularly of Istanbul is, in a way, personified in the character of his beloved Nuran.

Mümtaz likens Nuran to European paintings and Ottoman miniature throughout the novel, and highlights how Mümtaz sees Nuran as a key to the past and a representation of the connection to the past:

> …Had he never seen the photograph of Nuran wearing a Mevlevî outfit that İclâl once shown him, Mümtaz would have still compared the seated Nuran, legs folded beneath her as she listened to a gramophone record, to miniatures of an Orient even farther east than Istanbul. …Renoir's portrait of a reading woman was one such persona …Mümtaz's imagination, within its obsession for Nuran, at times took her resemblance to the Renoir even further, and uncovered the figure a likeness to the exuberance of flesh depicted by venerated Venetian masters of the Renaissance. … Nuran more closely recalled the Florentine woman in Ghirlandaio's *Presentation of the Virgin at the Temple* …The venture of living augmented exponentially through the enchantments of seeking Nuran in his surroundings and his past …and arts of centuries – essentially through different personae yet always as herself. Nuran, in his perspective, represented the golden key accessing time past. (204 – 5-6)

As if a musical polyphony, *Peace* becomes Tanpınar's composition where he presents old and new melodies of Turkish culture next to each other. By doing so, he highlights what has changed since the end of the Empire and how this change reflects upon the daily life of individuals as well as how it divides their identity. Mümtaz's longing for the year

spent with Nuran becomes a metaphor for his longing for the days of the Empire. Later in the novel, the reader finds further clues about how the past is personified within the identity of Nuran. Upon the end of his relationship with Nuran, Mümtaz feels an irreversible loss of the past:

> One year ago. Mümtaz cast glances about as if seeking the shortest possible route to the previous year. He'd come as far as the Seven Martyrs beyond the city's ancient land wall. The martyrs of Sultan Mehmed's conquest slept side by side in small stone tombs. …From the window of a two-story house, so run-down that it almost appeared – like those tiny sports cars – made of pasteboard, came the sound of a tango and in the middle of the street, dusty girls played a game. Mümtaz heard their *türkü* folk songs. (22)

The notion of "synthesis" between the traditional and the modern is a well-known issue for Tanpınar's readers. Modernization of the culture is valuable only if it does not neglect the cultural past, which still exists but is ostensibly ignored in Tanpınar's present moment. For him, a synthesis between the old and the new, East and West is possible and, in fact, it is the only solution to the identity question that Turkey of the 1930s face. Tanpınar suggests that it is not possible to forget the Ottoman past, as it is within us and in front of us wherever we look. He tries to convey this idea, often in a didactic tone, throughout the novel. When he walks through the flea market he realizes how the past, although altered in an uncanny way, is still alive in the present:

> …Remnants of out-of-fashion entertainments and the traces of old and grand traditions, whose origins and means had been forgotten, could be found heaped

> together. In one of these narrow, contiguous shops, old Istanbul, veiled Anatolia, and even the last remnants of the Ottoman Empire's heritage would glimmer in the most unanticipated way. Vintage outfits that varied from town to town, tribe to tribe, and period to period; old carpets and kilims whose locale of weaving he'd be sure to forget even once reminded, yet whose motifs and colors he'd recollect for days; a store of artwork from Byzantine icons to old Ottoman calligraphy panels; embroidery, decorations, all in all, caches of objects d'art' jewelry that had adorned all of it, in this humid and crepuscular world, could keep him in its thrall for hours with the allure of a long-past age and the appeal of the mysterious added in for good measure. This represented neither the traditional nor the modern East. Perhaps it was a state of timelessness whose very clime had been exchanged for another. (47)

The flea market exhibits the remnants of the past in the present and gives Tanpınar the chance to reflect upon the intertwined nature of manifestations of culture. The objects he describes represent more than their functional and material existence and embody a whole culture within them. For Mümtaz, time is not a simple answer to such a manifestation of the past. The question for Tanpınar is not only finding a way to synthesize the past in the present but understanding the meaning of such a synthesis as well.

Being the successors of an Empire cannot be a complete definition for the Turkey of the 1930s. This Turkey should create a new identity out of the Ottoman past, blending the past within the present. This can only be possible if Turks can fully acknowledge the

past and accept it with its glories and weaknesses: "Of course there are countries and citizens more content than we are; of course we feel in our lives …the vast fallout of two centuries of disintegration and collapse, of being the remnants of an empire and still unable to establish our own norms and idioms" (49). The time represented in *Peace* is a time when individuals feel at a loss. Mümtaz is an example of such an individual, but he is also the one who knows the way out of this state of mind: the synthesis between the past and present to produce something new, which can be neither purely Ottoman nor solely Turkish.

Istanbul, the epitome of Ottoman culture as Mümtaz sees the city, provides the writer the most suitable canvas to attain his goal. Mümtaz often visits *Sahaflar*, a place in the Beyazıd district of Istanbul close to Istanbul University, where old bookshops sell second hand and rare manuscripts. The description of *Sahaflar* in *Peace* presents a panorama of the richness of the Ottoman book culture as well as the complexity of representing various intertwined cultures at the same place:

> As Mümtaz looked at this shop, involuntarily he recalled Mallarmé's line: 'It's ended up here through some nameless catastrophe.' Here in this dusty shop from whose walls hung handmade tricot stockings… The Orient, however, couldn't be authentic anywhere, even in its grave, *Ex oriente lux* … beside these books, in open hawker's cases, were lapfuls of testimonials to our inner transformation, our desire to adapt, and our search for ourselves in new contexts and climes: pulp novels with illustrated covers, school textbooks, French yearbooks… as if the detritus of the mind of mankind had been hastily exposed in this market, books

> mixed and intermingled… Seen as a whole, it constituted a strange accretion that appeared simply to be the result of intellectual indigestion. Mümtaz realized this *corpus omnibus* had been engaged in a hundred-year struggle and a continuous sloughing of its skin. …An entire society grew despondent, strove, and suffered through anomie and birth pangs for a century so that digests of detective novels and these Jules Vernes might replace copies of *A Thousand and One Nights, Tûtinâme: Tales of the Parrot, Hâyatülhayvan: Animal Fables,* and *Kenzülhavas: The Treasury of Pleasantries*. (53)

The scene in the book market is particularly meaningful because it shows a fine reflection of how Mümtaz sees social changes since the collapse of the Empire and how he despises the cultural chaos now projected through this book market. He sits at one of the bookshops and scrambles some of the books of divan poetry, a songbook, a series of recorded births and deaths, which he describes as a "naïve attention to detail and ceremony" (55). When he skims through the "personal events" records that "Emin Efendi" opens a "saddle-and-harness shop" and "appointed to the Kapanidakik directorship." The following year his son "Hafız Numan Efendi" was initiated into the "field of musical arts." Their neighbor "Mehmet Emin Efendi would oversee his practice" (55), and so on. Reading all these personal records from the year "A.H. 1197," Mümtaz asks with an uncanny feeling overtaking him: "Who were these characters? Where did they live?" (*Peace* 55) Such accounts from the Ottoman records were not uncommon. Ottomans paid close attention to keeping records of daily events and even seemingly insignificant details of people's lives. Reading such records centuries later,

Mümtaz feels estranged from the past and knows that he cannot connect to the past by simply reading historical records. Mümtaz's strolling through *Sahaflar* and Istanbul validates his longing for the Ottoman past that he is no longer able to fully experience in his daily life.

In her book *The Future of Nostalgia*, Svetlana Boym focuses on European exiles of the late twentieth-century and explores how nostalgia, whose outbreak often follows "revolutions," functions in modern culture and cityscapes. She distinguishes nostalgia from "melancholia." Unlike melancholia, which is confined in the "individual consciousness," nostalgia is about the "relationship between individual biography and the biography of groups or nations, between personal and collective memory" (xvi). Byom then describes two different kinds of nostalgia: "restorative" and "reflective." The former "puts emphasis on *nostos*[68] and proposes to rebuild the lost home and patch up memory gaps" while the latter "dwells in *algia*, in longing and loss, the imperfect process of remembrance. … Reflective nostalgia," according to Byom, "characterizes national and nationalist revivals" in an essentialist way while "restorative nostalgia manifests itself in total reconstructions of monuments of the past," charged with melancholy (41).

Nostalgia, for Byom, is not only "an expression of local longing, but a result of a new understanding of time and space that made the division into "local" and "universal" possible" (xvi). She argues that nostalgia is not always about the past or fallen empire but

[68] Byom argues that nostalgia is a "paradoxical" term. "*Algia* – longing – is what we share; yet *nostos* – the return home – is what divides us" (xv).

also for "visions of the future that became obsolete" (xvi) due to hypermodern desire to erase the past or an uncritical acceptance and identification with the past:

> There is, in fact, a tradition of critical reflection on the modern condition that incorporates nostalgia, which I will call *off-modern*. The adverb *off* confuses our sense of direction; it makes us explore side shadows and back alleys rather than the straight road of progress; it allows us to take a detour from the deterministic narrative of twentieth-century history. Off-modernism offered a critique of both the modern fascination with newness and no less modern reinvention of tradition. In the off-modern tradition, reflection and longing, estrangement and affection go together. (xvii)

"*Off-modern*" offers a useful perspective on Tanpınar's protagonist. Although Mümtaz does not come from an exilic experience in the traditional sense, through the outcomes of the overnight cultural revolution, the individual's psychology is reminiscent of a person who is stripped from his homeland. His description and interaction with the Ottoman past and Istanbul correlate with Byom's term, "restorative nostalgia" while he also lives in a collective and "reflective" nostalgia through Republican nationalism. Mümtaz is desperately trying to restore the past through a literary search in *Sahaflar*. However, his nostalgia is mainly "*off-modern*" in Byom's terms, which allows him to make "sense of the impossibility of homecoming" (xvii), where he cannot come back to a fallen empire. What Mümtaz is looking for in *Sahaflar* is not something that could have been recorded in historical records. These artifacts of history do not open the door through which he can connect to the Ottoman past. Therefore, the scene where Mümtaz fails to connect to the

past by simply reading about it indicates that Tanpınar did not simply suggest bringing back the Ottoman culture as it was. Tanpınar understood that the modern Turkey was a new entity although it was rooted in the Ottoman past. Therefore, it needs to take its strength from this past but, at the same time, it needs to surpass its past to create its own identity.

The novel's use of the Ottoman architecture in Istanbul reinforces the writer's perspective on the city's historical meaning and suggests a criticism of how Istanbul was treated in the wake of the Republican Turkey as another way of commemorating the Ottoman past. Istanbul is a particularly significant place for Tanpınar both in his works and in his personal life. Born in Istanbul, Tanpınar expresses his admiration for the city in many of his writings and novels. For him, Istanbul was culture and history. Losing its status as the capital of Turkey at the dawn of the proclamation of the Republic in 1919, Istanbul gradually became the place for what the Republic did not represent, Ottoman culture, and tradition.

Peace is one of Tanpınar's books in which Istanbul functions as one of the characters. Mümtaz realizes from Nuran's accent on the very first day he hears her speak that she is an Istanbulite. As the story progresses, the reader realizes that being from Istanbul is a distinguishing feature for Mümtaz. "For Mümtaz, there were two fundamental and requisite criteria for feminine beauty: principally, to hail from Istanbul; and secondly, to be raised along the Bosphorus" (*Peace* 87). Istanbul functions as a text Mümtaz reads, analyzes and interprets as well as identifies with:

> On the Bosphorus, in contrast, everything summoned one inward and plummeted one into one's own depths. Here everything belonged to us… This was a realm of squat-minareted and small-mosqued villages… a realm of Bosphorus residences, of wooden dervish houses in whose courtyards goats now gazed, of quayside coffee-houses, the shouts of apprentice waiters mingled into the otherworld of Istanbul Ramadans like a salutation from the mortal world, of public squares filled with the memories of bygone wrestling matches… Besides, everything on the Bosphorus was a reflection. (132 – 3)

All these images and descriptions are part of the culture Mümtaz identifies with. He is so familiar with the city and its history that he talks about it in a subliminal way, which consists his identity. The "depth" of the images of the city in front of Mümtaz speaks to the depth of his identity. For him, Istanbul with its "dervish houses," "coffee-houses" and "public squares," is a way to commemorate and connect with the culture of the past.

Istanbul is as much a song as it is a text for Mümtaz. During his outings in the city with Nuran, Mümtaz takes the reader on an excursion in the city. In the descriptions of such trips, the third person omnipotent narrator narrates through Mümtaz's perspective. For Mümtaz, Nuran, Istanbul, and traditional Ottoman music become parts of a whole, which allows him to experience a taste of the culture, which he belongs:

> On days Nuran didn't come to Emirgân, the couple met either at the ferry landing or at Kanlıca, wandered the Bosphorus by caïque, went to beaches, and at times forayed as far as the heights of Çamlıca. …By and by, they gave names to locales of their choosing along the Bosphorus, as the Istanbul landscape of their

> imagination merged with traditional Ottoman music, and a Cartography of Voice and Vision steadily proliferated. …[Nuran] effectively became a luculent cluster between what rested in his thoughts and what existed in his surroundings, illuminating everything such that the most disparate elements became part of a synthetic whole. Ottoman music was one of these elements. After he'd met Nuran, this art form had in effect thrust open its doors. …A confounding nostalgia for the past seized him as he saw the first geometric boulevards made in Istanbul and the handsome streets with window-on-the-past names that conjured a genuine feast of an Istanbul evening. "Istanbul, Islambol," he repeated. "If we don't truly know Istanbul, we can never hope to find ourselves." In his soul, he'd now become brethren to destitute masses and houses verging on collapse.
>
> (193 – 195)

Detailed descriptions and names of the mosques that Mümtaz and Nuran visit provide their historical affiliations. The stories behind those buildings that Mümtaz narrates suggest that Tanpınar were trying to record them in his novel so that they are not forgotten. Serving this goal, Tanpınar gives room to the dervish lodges that were shut down by the Republic[69] to show how the abolition of the lodges is a part of the cultural

---

[69] The Turkish Law of December 13, 1925, orders the abolition of dervish lodges in Turkey. The actual Rule states: "Law 677, which prohibits and abolishes the profession of tomb-keeping, the assigning of mystical names, and the closing of tekkes (dervish lodges), zaviyes (central dervish lodges), and tombs. 13 December 1925. (1) All the tekkes and zaviyes in the Turkish Republic, either in the form of wakf (religious foundations) or under the personal property right of its sheikh or established in any other way, are closed. Those used as mosques [cami] and mescits (small mosques) may be retained as such. (2) All of the orders [tarikatler] using (titles such) as sheikh [sheyhlik], dervish [dervişlik], disciple [müritlik], senior dervish [dedelik], leader of the Mevlevi Order [chelebilik], descendent of the Prophet Muhammad [seyitlik], sheikh [babalik], descendent of the Prophet Muhammad [emirlik], dervish leader [nakiblik], deputy sheikh [halifelik], fortune-teller [falcılık]. Service to these titles and the wearing of dervish costume

loss he is trying to express and mourn after. For Mümtaz, the mystical Sufi tradition represented by the lodges was a "secret of significance" that the East discovered: "The secret of being able to see oneself and all existence as comprising a single totality" (197). However, this discovery, the Sufi notion of the East, was not necessarily a good thing according to Mümtaz. "Within a semipoetic dream, the Orient lived on the peripheries of reality. Needless to say, I don't find this worldview appealing; it strikes me as plodding and tiresome, like a journey by camel caravan" (197). Here, the reader witnesses Tanpınar's critical and conscious evaluation of the practices of the Ottoman culture. Tanpınar employs a similar attitude toward westernization and Turkish modernization.

The Ottoman theme is present in *Peace* in various forms, from Istanbul's architecture and particular cultural moments that the characters of the novel experience of the Ottoman classical music. Similar to Pamuk's use of miniature painting, Ottoman classical music becomes an overarching symbol of the Ottoman culture and Turkish identity in *Peace*. Nevertheless, Tanpınar composes his novel as if it were an elegy to the irreversible day-by-day loss of that culture, which is a questionable choice that Pamuk does not make through the miniature painting in *My Name is Red*. Represented as Turkish

---

are prohibited. The tombs of the dervish orders are closed, and the profession of tomb keeping is abolished. Those who open the closed tekkes or zaviyes, or the tombs, and those who re-establish them or those who give temporary places to the orders [tarikat] or to people who are called by any of the mystical name mentioned above or those who serve them, will be sentenced to at least three months in prison and will be fined at least fifty Turkish liras. (3: added 1949) (For the use of the titles) Sheikh, Baba, and Halife, such as found, not less than six months in prison and a heavy fine of not less than 500 Turkish liras, and not less than one year (in prison) for another offense. (4: added 1950) The tombs of great and famous Turks [Türbelerden Türk büyükler] can be opened in public for those who value great art by the Ministry of Culture. It is necessary to appoint civil servants for their maintenance." This law is only a part of Republican cultural revolution that aimed to end cultural and religious practices that were in effect during the Ottoman Empire. This abolition resonated negatively in people's discontent with the Republic's attitude toward religious beliefs. January 23, 2014, www.dar-al-masnavi.org/anti-dervish.law.html.

intellectuals in the 1930s, Mümtaz and İhsan acknowledge that they have already been distanced from the musical culture of the Ottomans:

> We don't know one percent of what's really out there. … if we could just save ourselves a little from today's popular music! Just think for a minute, you're a country that's given rise to a musician like İsmail Dede Efendi; composers like Seyid Nuh, Ebubekir Ağa, and Hafız Post[70] have come along and composed works of extraordinary merit. Part of our identity has been formed by their artistry. We're not even aware of the fact that we're living in a state of spiritual hunger… This is the catastrophe: Assume that today's generation vanished. These works, many of which are only known by heart, will simply disappear. (92 – 3)

İhsan's words function as a call for the reader to preserve the Ottoman music as well as its culture because, for Tanpınar, the identity of the Turks can only be protected through its past culture since culture and identity are codependent. Tanpınar's knowledge and

---

[70] Names listed in this quote refer to the historical musicians of Classical Turkish Mûsıkî. Although used as synonymous to 'music,' which is generally associated with the music of the world, the term mûsıkî particularly refers to an old tradition belonging to the Middle East. İsmail Dede Efendi (1778 – 1846) was a Turkish classical music composer. His music was appreciated by the Ottoman Sultans of his time, such as Sultan Selim III. He was trained in *Mevlevi* dervish lodge and received the title of "dede," the highest level of a religious leader in the Alevi community, and composed many songs for *Mevlevi* rituals. The *Mevlevi* order is presented in *Peace* as intertwined Turkish classical music. Seyid Nuh (d. 1714) was another composer who practiced his music during the greatest period of Ottoman Court Mûsıkî. Musicians trained within the palace itself and outside the palace were "sometimes given permanent employment at court or invited to take part now and again in musical activities" (Pekin). The Ottoman Court was a system of hierarchy where individuals acquired various skills from arts to sciences to get a high position in the Empire. Hafız Post (1630 – 1694) and Eyyûbî Ebubekir Ağa (d. 1759) were among highly influential Ottoman composers. Eyyûbî Ebubekir Ağa's most famous composition "Mahur Beste" (Song in Mahur) is also the title of Tanpınar's another novel. In the preface to that novel, Tanpınar states: "Bu romanı büyük bestekârımız Eyyûbî Ebubekir Ağa'nın ruhuna ithaf ediyorum" [I dedicate this novel to the spirit of our great composer Eyyûbî Ebubekir Ağa]. Mahur Beste is cited in *Peace* as a song of unhappy love and presented as a prophetic symbol for the end of Mümtaz's and Nuran's love.

appreciation of Turkish classical music come through in his novel. A reader of *My Name is Red* could notice how Pamuk's novel is reminiscent of *Peace* regarding its use of a particularly Ottoman art as a way to resurrect the past. While *My Name is Red* is often attributed to being a "painting" of Pamuk, *Peace* is a musical composition of Tanpınar in which both authors resurrect the culture of the Ottoman past and present it to the world of the twenty-first century.

"The Song in Mahur" and the story behind it follow Nuran's life as if it were a curse. "'The Song in Mahur' – a family heirloom with its intermittent acquiescence to turpitude and keepsakes of cruelty, with its torments resembling the return to a primordial, primitive state of sorts – forged an abyss through these twin legacies, an abyss presently yawning within Nuran and summoning her" (158). The thought of the unhappy love story of Nuran's great grandmother, recorded in the lines and melody of this song, never leaves Nuran's thoughts as she is afraid of experiencing the same kind of pain through love. As she goes to visit Mümtaz for the first time in his house, which would not be appropriate for a divorced woman of her age to do, Nuran is nervous but cannot help her "physical desire." Mümtaz tells her: "I've bought some new Debussy. Come no matter what…" Nuran thinks "To admire Debussy and Wagner yet to live the "Song in Mahur" was the fate of being a Turk" (162).

Ottoman classical music functions as a way in which Tanpınar conveys the culture of the Ottomans in his novel while he tries to reinstate the Ottoman culture in the Turkey of the 1930s. Tanpınar's knowledge of Ottoman classical music is projected on his protagonist Mümtaz, as Mümtaz details the different *makams* and composers of this

artistic tradition. His ideas about the Ottoman classical music and his chronicles of it make *Peace* an accurate source for later generations to remember the richness of the Ottoman music:

> According to Mümtaz, *a la turca* music resembled Ottoman classical poetry. In that case as well, one had to decide between genuine art and simple imitation. More precisely, pieces selected with today's level of discernment, the criteria of Western tastes, could be deemed to be rather beautiful. In addition to these *makams*, they played Hüseyni through a few works of Tab'î Mustafa Efendi's caliber and some of İsmail Dede Efendi;s songs; in the Hicaz *makam*, they played Haji Halil Efendi's famous *semâi* … masters like Emin Dede … kept alive purest of classical tastes in the present like a belated spring or an exotic plant that adapted well to new soil. Mümtaz maintained that these works demonstrated how classical Ottoman music merged with modern sensibilities and tastes. What he discovered in the old masters of schools of painting, considered to be "modern" now for the past fifty or sixty years, who were trained between 1400 and 1500, that is, a genuine innovation in aesthetics and sensibility, he also found in these musical genres, the *beste*, the *semâi* and the *şarkı*, and languid, gilded songs called *kâr* ... what flourished here was the essential delicacy … the true reign, namely, the Sultanate of the Soul. (170 – 1)

Tanpınar chooses to narrate this section as if it were an encyclopedia entry, suggesting his intent to record actual details about Ottoman classical music in order to convey this knowledge of culture to the following generations through his novel, which constitutes a

moment that would justify Pamuk's claim to Tanpınar's didacticism. "The Sultanate of the Soul" is the classical Ottoman music that Mümtaz cannot leave behind like the "Sultanate" of the Empire that the Republic left behind. In different *makams* of classical Ottoman music, Mümtaz resurrects the past, an indispensable part of his identity. This notion becomes so intense in the novel that Tanpınar keeps repeating how Ottoman classical music is a vital part of Turkish identity in a didactic manner:

> Whether we like it or not, we belong to it [the past]. We admire our traditional music and for better or worse it speaks to us. For better or worse we hold this key that unlocks the past for us… The past relinquishes its epochs to us one after another and dresses us in its clothing. Because we harbor a treasury within ourselves and perceive our surroundings through a Ferahfezâ or a Sultanîyegâh *makam*, even Lebîb Efendi is a source of art to us. In Mümtaz's esteem, everything from an Istanbul *paysage* to the entire Turkish culture, its filth, its decay, and its splendor was contained in traditional music. The Occident roamed dumbly in our midst like a stranger due to its inability to fathom our music. (198)

Nuran's involvement in the classical Turkish music through her family that includes composers and singers allows Mümtaz to have a bond with the young woman. Nuran's family belongs to *mevlevi* tradition[71] on her father's side and the Bektashi[72] tradition on

---

[71] A *Mevlevi* order is a traditional Islamic sufi way that has maintained the spiritual teachings of Mawlânâ Jalâluddîn Rûmî (1207 – 1273) and his descendants.

[72] Bektashi tradition is another mystic tradition that follows the teachings of Haji Bektashi Veli (1208 – 1270) a contemporary of Rûmî. They both supported humanitarianism and tolerance in their teachings. He influenced many Turkish poets such as Yunus Emre (1238 – 1320), Pir Sultan Abdal (1480 – 1550), who referred to Bektashi's doctrines in their poems. Rûmî and Bektashi were good friends and had a lot in common in their philosophies. Probably the major difference between the two was that while Rûmî wrote

her mother's side, which means she witnessed and participated in a number of rituals where traditional Turkish music was played. Tanpınar sets this bond to shape his main character's desire for the past and reflects it upon his desire for his beloved, Nuran. As the novel progresses, Nuran's existence, initially presented as a love story, gains a symbolic meaning about the representation of Ottoman culture that Mümtaz does not want to forget.

Mümtaz sees Nuran in the light of the Ottoman culture in many levels. Throughout the novel, Mümtaz's personification of the past in Nuran's character is repeated in the associations that he makes about her. He likens Nuran's photograph taken in *mevlevi* robes to a miniature painting. "That's a striking picture. You resemble depictions in old miniatures," (136-7) says Mümtaz. Such associations with the elements of the Ottoman culture become even clearer during the couple's outings in the city. During these excursions, they visit districts mostly along the Bosphorus and the reader observes the city through Mümtaz's eyes, along with his attempts to place Nuran in the days of the past in his mind. However, the reader notices a striking difference when introduced Nuran's own perspective of the past, which contradicts how Mümtaz sees her. When they visit "the historic lodge" (it is not clear what specific lodge Tanpınar refers here, but it is one of the dervish lodges in Istanbul), Nuran is disappointed with what she sees as it is not as Nuran "had anticipated" because "it had no grandeur" (146). "Nuran roamed about trying to read the old Ottoman calligraphy on the wall panels and watched

---

in Persian and appealed to the educated elite, Bektashi wrote in Arabic and was mainly read by soldiers and peasants. After the Republic, all religious orders were viewed with suspicion and outlawed in 1925.

her apparition hover in antique mirrors of time past. The peculiar redolence of the historic lingered everywhere. This, our scent within history, was so reminiscent of who we were" (147). Although she finds the lodge quite humble, Nuran appreciates its plain nature: "As she wandered the lodge, she acquired a taste for its pleasure. Here existed the beauty of simplicity. It wasn't overwrought with excess and opulence like the châteaux at which she gazed in photographs in *L'llustracion* or English magazines" (147). The comparison Nuran makes between "the châteaux" and the lodge reveals her source of knowledge and brings in a gaze, which is estranged from its culture and conditioned by the taste set by western magazines.

While allowing both Mümtaz and his reader to see Nuran as a personification of the Ottoman past, Tanpınar ironically creates Mümtaz and Nuran as considerably different in their perspectives of life. Nuran is quite different from Mümtaz in various ways. While Mümtaz's mind is so occupied with the past, Nuran often encourages him to live the present and enjoy the time he has. Most of the stories, questions and nostalgia related to the past that Mümtaz bores Nuran. When it comes to the issue of identity, Nuran's ideas also differ from Mümtaz significantly. Mümtaz sees himself as an inextricable part of the past, Nuran, on the other hand, prefers to define her identity outside the past. For Nuran, enjoying the present and not worrying about the past, which is already "lost," is a more reasonable way of living one's life: "Mümtaz's obsession with things past gave Nuran the inkling that he wanted nothing more than to be sequestered in catacombs. The world certainly offered myriad pleasures and other modes of thought" (198). Bored and even irritated by Mümtaz's fixation with the long-dead figures from the

past, and hurt by how Mümtaz mentions that Nuran is preoccupied with her daughter Fatma in the same way he is preoccupied with the people of the Ottoman past, Nuran reacts: " I might be preoccupied with my daughter, but you're meddling with corpses seven centuries old" (201). Mümtaz thinks that because he remembers those people, they will not be forgotten, an idea that becomes reminiscent in Tanpınar's motivation to mention, in substantial detail, the musicians, sultans and other historical figures in his novel:

> We're their sole guardians. If we don't give them a modicum of our existence, they'll lose their only right to live. Poor forefathers, maestros of music, poets, and everyone else whose name and influence has reached our day, they wait with such longing to enrich our lives… and accost us in the most unexpected places …Nuran had been gradually growing tired of his life and thoughts. (201-2)

The novel functions as a medium where Tanpınar records Ottoman forefathers. During their visit to the lodge, Mümtaz continues imagining Nuran as an image coming alive out of the past. However, this time, Mümtaz's perception reflects his acquaintance with European paintings:

> Mümtaz's imagination … cast Nuran as a beloved of old, like a favorite odalisque of the age of Sultan Murat IV. Jewelry, shawls, fabric, adorned with silver embroidery, Venetian tulle, rose-peach slippers… a mound of cushions surrounding her. He revealed his thoughts to her. "You mean, like an odalisque, is that so? You know, the kind painted by Matisse?" And she shook her head as she laughed. "No, thanks. I'm Nuran. I live in Kandilli, in the year 1938 and I wear

more or less the fashions of my day. I have no desire to change my style or identity. (147)

European odalisque paintings are often interpreted as artistic products of Orientalism, which has been repeated and turned into a sense of self-orientalism in Turkey. An orientalist image conditions Mümtaz's imagination of the past and his *exotic* descriptions of a woman from the Orient. By making Mümtaz have such a mental image, Tanpınar shows the dilemma that a Turkish intellectual would have during the period. Exposed to western orientalist imagery and taught to interpret the Ottoman past through European lenses, Mümtaz as the Turkish intellectual describes the photograph in words that are associated with Orientalism. The scene also shows two different perspectives about the past. For Nuran, living in the present without being attached to the past or being nostalgic about it is what one needs to do in order to attain a new identity. Nuran finds her own identity within "the fashions" of her day without attachment to the past. Nuran's refusal to be likened to an "odalisque" echoes Republican dislike of being associated with anything that connotes the Ottoman past, such as the orientalist image of an "odalisque."[73]

---

[73] The French Word "odalisque" originates from the Turkish Word "odalık" meaning a chambermaid driving from the Turkish Word "oda" which means a chamber. The word is roughly defined as a female slave or concubine in a Turkish harem. These women usually served to the mother of the Sultan and if they have any exclusive talent, such as singing or dancing they could promote to the position of a concubine and would have the chance to see the Sultan. During the nineteenth-century, the image of an odalisque became one of the most used images for European artists and the most-known fantasy figure of orientalist art that European painters and authors exploited. Paintings depicted odalisques as erotic and voluptuous in a harem setting. A naked reclining woman is depicted in odalisque paintings trying to satisfy the Western fantasy of the Turkish harems. Some of the famous paintings of odalisques include *Odalisque* (1874) by Jules Joseph Lefebvre; *L'Odalisque* (1749) by François Boucher Louvre; *La Grand Odalisque* (1814) and *Odalisque with A Slave* (1842) by Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres; *Odalisque* (1885) by Juan Luna. For a brief historiography of orientalist art, see "Orientalism in Nineteenth-Century Art" by Jennifer Meagner in

For Mümtaz, Nuran not only resembles the Ottoman paintings but also other artistic personas in "miniatures of an Orient even farther east than Istanbul." For Mümtaz, French painter Pierre-Auguste Renoir's *The Reader (Young Woman Reading a Book)* (1876) is another eastern work of art that he can compare to Nuran. Moreover, for Mümtaz, even the Venetian Renaissance paintings, such as Ghirlandaio's *Presentation* from 1486-90 could resemble Nuran. What could be the connotations of a glimpse of "imagination" that likens a supposedly "eastern" woman, an Ottoman Turk – recently self-defined as a "modern Turk" – to the figures both in a fifteenth-century Italian and a nineteenth-century French painting, at the same time, by a fictional twentieth-century Turkish intellectual? What Tanpınar calls "Mümtaz's imagination" indicates the way the author shows a multi-cultural definition of the "past" that Mümtaz, a fictional character, could contemplate and reflect upon his lover. The picture that Tanpınar draws with Mümtaz's imagination indicates anything but a Turkish identity that is racially and culturally pure.

With Nuran, Tanpınar seems to question the gender roles imposed on the image of the Turkish woman that Republican and nationalist literature promoted. The type that the nationalist literature depicted defeminized the female in literature and gave her the role of either a sister or a mother in an unfeminine, nonsexual nature. Betraying the Republican gender roles of asexuality and female archetypes in Turkish literature, Nuran is an exemplary character among her Turkish fictional contemporaries that almost solely

---

Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000–. August 25, 2014, www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/euor/hd_euor.htm.

consist of mothers, nurses, and nationalist wives. Nuran is also a mother in the novel; however, her sexuality is not defined or repressed by her motherhood. Tanpınar creates Nuran as a divorced woman who is having a romantic relationship with a man two years younger than him. She can roam around Istanbul with her lover although she has to be careful about not being seen with Mümtaz by her relatives. These characteristics are quite different from the image of a nurse during the Independence War, or a mother whose only aim is to raise his children as nationalist literature depicts woman as such. Nuran is sexual, feminine, social, and considerably westernized.

While distinguishing her character from a nationalist nurse or mother, Tanpınar equally distances her from typical Ottoman assumptions when it comes to female representation. He makes a clear distinction between Nuran, as the New Woman and the type of woman associated with "traditional" societies where they do not have agency by juxtaposing Nuran with her mother. His description of Nuran's mother outlines how women of the past decades were different. Compared to the perceived identity of Nuran's mother, Nuran's generation can be considered the first generation that comes out of a cultural veil put on the female sex:

> [Mümtaz] found Nuran's mother to be as he'd expected. Nazife, having come of age around the 1908 constitutional revolution, exhibited a number of endearing characteristics like many who'd grown accustomed to seeing life from beneath a gauzy black veil. She satisfied many a pleasure through a furtive glance. …Under the influence of those years, she was very progressive in thought but very reserved with regard to her actions. She'd been loved madly by a husband who

was twenty years her senior, …These traits constituted the persona of Nuran's mother as the wife of Rasim, one time provincial governor and *ney*-flutist. (175)

Mümtaz describes Nazife in further detail and depicts her as a representation of the women of a certain period and social status. Tanpınar's struggle with depicting the Ottoman and modern Turkish women becomes discernible with the differences between Nuran and Nazife:

> Nuran's mother had traced the careers of almost every high official in the Committee of Union and Progress and was a repository of forgotten facts retrieved with astounding memory – represented the changes that the 1908 revolution had forged in women of a certain class. That day, Mümtaz realized what a harmonious synthesis these distinct identities made in Nazife (175).

Nazife is not only a woman of the past; she is also a living memory of the times during the last years of the Empire. The striking difference between Nuran and her mother shows that many things changed in the country. Tanpınar seems to admit that women gained agency with the Republic of Turkey in three decades. However, while winning this agency, the new woman of Turkey cut off her connection to her Ottoman identity. Nuran does not want to recognize her Ottoman past because she thinks it takes away her agency is representative of early feminist ideas in Turkey.

Throughout the novel, Tanpınar reflects upon various significant changes that came with Republican cultural revolution. One of those changes is the Turkish language reform (1928; 1932), which occurred as a momentous part of Turkish nationalism. The Turkish Alphabet Reform in 1928 abandoned the Arabic script for Latin alphabet and in

1932, the Language Revolution began a campaign against words with Arabic and Persian origin in modern Turkish. The "pure Turkish" phenomenon changed modern Turkish more and more in time so much so that books from the 1930s and 40s became almost inaccessible to Turks by the 1980s and 90s and had to be "simplified" by translations to more modern Turkish.[74] Geoffrey Lewis rightly calls it a "revolution" rather than a "reform" referring to the meaning conveyed by the word *devrim* in Turkish for its considerable success (3). The impact of this reform echoed in the culture for decades. In this novel, Tanpınar expresses his stance on the language change through Mümtaz. Mümtaz admires when Nuran "resorted to antiquated words" and "even delighted in doing so" (*Peace* 175). Mümtaz's nostalgia for the past resonates on a linguistic level as well:

> …after a very long note, she was able to follow with the slightest denouements. Known as the 'Istanbulite inflection' this equated to one's being raised within the politesse and refinement that the eighteenth-century Ottoman poets Nedim and Nabî had so admired; what in part constituted the charm of established middle-class families and large households" (176).

Language is a crucial aspect of a culture and can manifest more than words can tell. This reading of the language gives Tanpınar the chance to express how the language reform transformed the daily life of Turks. Mümtaz keeps on contemplating upon the language and "antique words" that Nuran uses. Such words allow Mümtaz to permeate into the

[74] Such translations are called "sadeleştirilmiş Türkçe," meaning "simplified Turkish."

world of old Turkish language and imagine the whole world around it that modern Turkish is incapable of expressing:

> Neither the poets nor novelists of the fin de siècle Edebiyat-ı Cedid movement of modern literature, nor the newspaper collections that he'd combed at one time while gathering research materials for İhsan, could convey the era of Sultan Abdülhamit II as much as these "menageries of glass" – where had Nuran found this phrase that was yet another facet of her puerile imagination? Whenever he recalled the phrase, he'd conjure his beloved among subtle and pastel-hued glassware: antique, spiral-patterned "nightingale's nest" vessels of indigo, terra-cotta red, and robin's egg blue; rococo, hull-shaped fruit bowls or plates covered with the ornamental designs of leather-bound tomes; and Nuran would appropriate the refractions and timbre of all these delicate and fragile pieces requiring an infinitude of care. Doubtless, they contained hints of *a la franga* modernity. But they still represented a distinct aesthetic difference. (177)

Tanpınar reveals the world behind a single phrase and attaches it to a larger world that reveals various associations. In addition to Tanpınar's brilliant metaphors in his writings, the lexicon he chooses to use in the Turkish version of the novel shows his position toward the language reform in Turkey. In her book, Nergis Ertürk describes the linguistic context in which Tanpınar was writing:

> Situated in literary-historical terms at the crossroads marked by Bergson, Valéry, and Mallarmé, on the one hand, and by Ottoman and modern Turkish poets, such as Şeyh Galip, Ahmet Haşim, and Yahya Kemal, on the other, Tanpınar's body of

> work can be read as an effort to overcome what he frequently called a "crisis" (kriz) in language. (*Grammatology* 112)

Refusing to abide by the rules of the language reform, Tanpınar deliberately uses words that were being eradicated from Turkish to 'purify' the language. "The literary register Tanpınar developed for himself, meanwhile, which was fiercely criticized by his contemporaries for its 'archaic' lexicon, ornate poeticisms, and Ottoman themes, stands today as a vital word-archive of a modern Turkish language in continually accelerating transition, during the second quarter of the twentieth-century" (112). The language reform had significant cultural implications. As Göknar points out, it "created an epistemological barrier between the cultural heritage of the Ottoman state and Islam and the newly established Republic. New nationalised generations would hence have little or no textual access to the recent Ottoman-Islamic past" ("The Novel in Turkish" 488). Tanpınar was among the few authors who publicly voiced their discomfort with the reform by using archaic words in their books. This attitude toward the reform becomes even more evident in *The Time Regulation Institute* that I examine in the following section.

It is not only the reforms but also larger cultural implications those reforms resulted in that Tanpınar weaves into his plot. A distant relative and a friend of Mümtaz from high school as another lover of Nuran, the character Suad, comes into the scene in the Nuran chapter of the novel as a complete disturbance to Mümtaz's dream to become happy with Nuran. For Mümtaz, "there was something he couldn't put his finger on that disturbed him about Suad" (*Peace* 104). Mümtaz learns that Suad, who has a serious

illness and is about to die from it, sends Nuran a love letter and suddenly turns into a threat for the couple's decision to get married. The discussions between Suad (as well as their friends Nuri and Orhan) and Mümtaz become instrumental in learning about Tanpınar's ideas about the state of the society during the time. It is during these gatherings where all four of them and İhsan talk about then-current issues of the country, particularly how to preserve the past and adapt to the West at the same time. The ideas they voice correspond to the varying and often contradicting ideas that busied the minds of the intellectuals of the period. Tanpınar uses these gatherings among his characters to emphasize his own perspective on such issues through İhsan and Mümtaz. İhsan puts a finger on the problem with westernization and Turkish identity as Tanpınar sees it.

Tanpınar's didactic tone, for which Pamuk criticized him, is distinct in such scenes. In one of such dialogues among İhsan, Mümtaz, Suad and the others, İhsan comments on what the general reading practice of a nation can tell about a culture and argues that it is manifested upon the problem between national identity and westernization, which indicates Tanpınar's observation of self-orientalism among Turkish intellectuals. For İhsan, in order to attain a 'new' identity Turks need to blend the Ottoman past and the modern West:

> The issue is this: The things we read don't lead us anywhere. When we read what's written about Turks, we realize that we're wandering on the peripheries of life. A Westerner only satisfies us when he happens to remind us that we're citizens of the world. In short, most of us read as if embarking on a voyage as if escaping our own identities. Herein rests the problem. Meanwhile, we're in the

> process of creating a new social expression particular to us. …with one leap to shake and cast out the old, the new, and everything else. Leaving neither French Ronsard nor his contemporary in the East Fuzûlî… (105)

Tanpınar's rather optimistic notion of a synthesis between East and West to create a new Turkish identity which is based on the Ottoman past but also feeds itself from the Western culture while maintaining a perfect balance between the two, is conveyed to the readers in different forms throughout the novel. This is how he thinks the nation can attain 'peace.' However, Tanpınar is also responsive to the nuances among the various ideas for such a synthesis. İhsan favors the idea that by leaving both East and West but using knowledge from both of them at the same time, a new life and a strong identity is possible for Turks. For Mümtaz, however, İhsan's idea is not even a possibility: "It's impossible because …to begin with, we'd be creating a tabula rasa in vain. What do you think we'll gain through such a refutation besides the loss of our very selves?" (106). Mümtaz claims that it is not possible both to disown and take advantage of the Ottoman identity. When Suad supports İhsan and tells him that "The new.. We'll establish the myth of a new world, as in America and Soviet Russia;" Mümtaz answers: "Don't lose the sight of the fact that both the United States and Russia are extensions of Europe" (*Peace* 106). While Mümtaz thinks that İhsan favors the notion that the New they are talking about will lead to the abandonment of the old making Turks lose their identity, İhsan, as if trying to suit Mümtaz's concern, says: "we'll try to establish a New Life particular to us and benefiting our own idiom" (106), suggesting a transformation of the old in order to create "the new" that new Turkish nation is trying to attain. İhsan further

articulates his idea: "A myth… erupts from social life. But to cut our ties with the past and to close ourselves off from the West! Never! What do you think we are? We're the essence of Easterners of taste and pleasure. Everything yearns for our persistence and continuity" (107). These conversations among the characters imply Tanpınar's dilemma.

Making his characters represent nuanced ideas about Turkish identity, Tanpınar opens a window to the intelligentsia in the Turkey of the 1930s. Tanpınar's pluralism and sense of mixed emotions gain appreciation from Pamuk. Tanpınar must imagine a future via the past which Pamuk also acknowledges. This scene is the first one where Tanpınar almost speaks to his reader directly through his characters. The metaphors, allegories, symbols and ambiguity of narrative that consists most of Pamuk's narrative style do not exist in Tanpınar's *Peace*. Tanpınar simply tells his reader, in a rather realist tone that could be almost identical to a real conversation among Turkish intellectuals of the time is narrated in the novel. Ideas such as the New Life, the New Man, New Society, echoing the Soviet world, represent the phenomenon that modernity and realism would repeat among its ideals. Tanpınar wants his novel to speak through such ideologies. To further this notion, Tanpınar situates it into a context that is larger than Turkey, but, in fact, is a matter of the new world. Suad says: "…but I want to hear the sounds of unadulterated folk songs. I want to look out upon the world through new eyes. Not just for Turkey, I want this for the entire world. I want to hear songs of tribute sung for the newly born. …The New Man won't acknowledge a single remnant of the past" (107). Upon these words, Mümtaz asks Suad to define the New Man to which Suad voices the idea that seems, in fact, to be Tanpınar's: "I can't [provide a description of the New Man]. He has

yet to be born. But he will be born, of that I'm certain. The entire world is moaning from the labor of his birth. Take Spain for example!" (107).

Tanpınar acknowledges that he does not have a definition for the New Man or the New Life that his characters, as well as the intelligentsia of not only Turkey but also Europe, are forming. Mümtaz repeats the necessity of embracing the past throughout the novel, as Tanpınar insists on making Mümtaz create the New Life from the ashes of the Empire: "A New Life is necessary. Maybe I've mentioned this to you [Nuran] before. In order to leap forward or reach new horizons, one still has to stand on some solid ground. A sense of identity is necessary… Every nation appropriates this identity from its golden age" (198). The "golden age" and "solid ground" Mümtaz is referring to seems to be the Ottoman culture. Thus, Tanpınar's infamous idea of "synthesis" is a condition for the continuity of the culture and a transformed modern Turkish identity.

Modern Times: *The Time Regulation Institute*

Neither am I inside time,
Nor altogether without [75]

I shall leave behind a work that I believe will more or less secure me a place in the annals of history.

— Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *The Time Regulation Institute*, 9

Maureen Freely and Alexander Dawe translated *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) into English. Penguin Classics series published the novel on December 31, 2013. On Amazon, where the book is listed for sale as the "first-ever English translation" is, in fact, not the first translation of the novel. Ender Gürol, a Turkish translator, translated the novel into English for the first time in 2001; however, it did not receive the current public recognition that the newer translation currently receives mainly because of not being "very imaginative, failing to reproduce much of the range of Tanpınar's Turkish.[76]" This timely translation has produced a number of reviews[77] have already been published about the novel and its translation to this date.

---

[75] The first two lines of Tanpınar's famous poem titled as its first line gains further meaning when considered with his novel *Time*. These lines are also engraved on his gravestone. Translated by Erdağ Göknar.

[76] Quoted in Nergis Ertürk's insightful review of the novel, "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar in Translation" which focuses on the qualities of its translation. 21 June 2014, photography.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/18456/ahmet-hamdi-tanpinar-in-translation.

[77] Some of the reviews include the one by Daniel Jacobs in *World Literature Today* and Said Sayrafiezadeh in *Publishers Weekly*.

It seems hard to disregard Pamuk's role, both directly and indirectly, on the current recognition the novel in English seems to enjoy. Pamuk's reputation in the world undeniably increased after the Noble Prize in 2006. Before Pamuk, the Western world knew little, if any, about modern Turkish literature. Upon Pamuk's success in the world's literary market, other Turkish authors also published and got translated into other languages. Maureen Freely, Pamuk's former translator, is only one of the reasons why the novel seems to carry a strange shadow of Pamuk's literary name. Pamuk's praise for the novel, which goes as "An allegorical masterpiece… Tanpınar is undoubtedly the most remarkable author in modern Turkish literature" is listed on the front cover of the book. The first sentence of the introduction by Pankaj Mishra, an Indian novelist and a friend of Orhan Pamuk, starts with the name of the author: "Orhan Pamuk has called Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar the greatest Turkish novelist of the twentieth century" (vii), as if to give literary merit to the novel in front of the Western audience, who might not be familiar with Tanpınar. Outside marketing concerns that the publisher of the novel's English version might have, Pamuk's representational presence in the presentation of Tanpınar's novel in English tells more about global literary trends that are mainly determined by those with global fame.

Time's translation into English received considerable attention in Turkish newspapers and magazines under headlines such as "The U.S. is reading Tanpınar;" "Tanpınar is recognized in America;" "USA is discovering Tanpınar" and the like.[78]

[78] Major Turkish daily newspapers, such as *Milliyet*, *Hürriyet*, and *Radikal* covered the translation of Tanpınar's book in detail during January 2014. It would not be wrong to say that Tanpınar is being "discovered" not only in the U.S. but in Turkey as well.

Obviously, Turkey seems happy about this reinforced presence in the world literary scene, this time, however, with Tanpınar. Most of these newspaper articles quoted Martin Riker's review of the book "A Ramshackle Modernity" published in *New York Times* soon after the publication of the novel. Riker underlines the "packaging" of the translation "including a timeline of Turkish history, an explanatory note from the translators, text notes, and an introduction… detailing cultural history behind Tanpınar" and refers to the marketing strategies of publishers that "suffers a little from that tic we sometimes bring to translated literature, of making the foreign book seem more foreign than it is."

Riker's review is full of praise for the novel calling it a "Menippean satire" that "creates an allegorical premise at once specific and broad enough to effectively satirize the entire 20th century."[79] In fact, in his revival of the ancient Greek term "Menippean satire" in *Anatomy of Criticism*, Northrop Frye argues that the Menippean satirist has a keen observation of absurdity, hypocrisy, and interprets it as an intellectual problem, which, in Tanpınar's novel, becomes the Turkish obsession with modernity (290 – 310). Rilke's ascription of the term to the novel does justice to the intellectual and gentle ridicule of the country's early attempts to modernize. The kind of cosmopolitan synthesis

---

[79] The point Riker makes about the novel's timely translation is worth mention here: "For beyond the historical relevance, beyond the comic esprit, Tanpınar's elaborate bittersweet sendup of Turkish culture over a half-century ago speaks perfectly clearly to our own, offering long-distance commiseration to anyone whose life is twisted around schedules and deadlines — pretty much everyone, in other words — provided you can find the time to read it." "A Ramshackle Modernity," Martin Riker. May 14, 2014, www.nytimes.com/2014/01/05/books/review/the-time-regulation-institute-by-ahmet-hamdi-tanpinar.html?ref=review&_r=1.

of past and present that Tanpınar argued so enthusiastically in *A Mind at Peace* is missing in the modernization that Turkey followed and which subordinated tradition to modernity, as Tanpınar shows in *Time*.

Tanpınar's novel questions modernization phenomenon through Turkish modernity and thus it offers a valuable critical questioning of the modernity itself. Modern Turkey's founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is often praised for being able to create a modern nation-state out of an Empire that had lost its function and was about to surrender the country to European invaders. This argument has unquestionable political validity. The novel, however, shows the cultural problems of Turkish modernism through the struggle the people of modern Turkey as well as the cultural implications and consequences of Turkish modernization and search for a new Turkish identity.

Moving beyond East-West schism, this seemingly local satire of Turkish modernism and Turkishness, however, can also be read as a critique of European modernity, which belittles the postcolonial reading of the novel and Turkish novel in general, as Pankaj Misra does in the introduction to the novel when he attributes to the story as "the obscure sufferings of people in 'less developed' societies." Mishra places Tanpınar in the company of Jun'ichirō Tanizaki, Rabindranath Tagore, and Lu Xun as authors of "the experience of arriving late in the modern world, as naïve pupils to find one's future foreclosed and already defined by other people's past and present." However, *Time*'s modern world is more of a story of modernity itself than it is that of a 'naïve pupil' of the West.

Time was first serialized from June to September 1954 in the newspaper *Yeni İstanbul* (New Istanbul) and then published as a book in 1962. Not surprisingly, it did not bring Tanpınar the recognition he hoped to receive but showered him with fierce criticism, mostly because of the novel's attitude toward the Republican modernism project and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's reforms. It is a brilliant satire of "ramshackle modernity" that Turkey tried to adopt from the West, particularly following the proclamation of the Republic. Through his memoir, the narrator Hayri İrdal tells his story and the foundation of the Time Regulation Institute, whose purpose is to sync all the clocks of Turkey to save time and by doing so, to catch up with the modern age. The system of synchronization of the clocks is a pure allegory for the society, which tries to synchronize with Western modernism. Each character in the novel comes with its own world of representations, implications and meanings that illustrate various aspects of Turkish society in the first half of the twentieth-century. The novel's translated afterlife is still new, but it indicates a stronger presence of Turkish literature in the world.

Turkey's westernization and modernization are satirized and thereby criticized, at the heart of the novel through Tanpınar's keen pen. The author deals with these issues in a sophisticated and complex manner that demands more than one way of explaining the novel. It is not only the phenomenon of becoming modern that Tanpınar deals within his novel. He is also concerned with saving the Ottoman past, in a way, a systematic erasure through the cultural revolution, which concerned Tanpınar throughout his life. Disowning the Ottoman past, modern Turkey had to invent a history that located the origin of the Turks outside the Ottomans. Tanpınar mocks such attempts in the novel with the story of

Ahmet the Timely, an invented historical character that I examine in detail later in this section. As one of the novel's major characters, Halit Ayarcı clearly illustrates with his words: "Being a realist does not mean seeing the truth for what it is. It is a question of determining our relationship with the truth in the way that is most beneficial for us" (*Time* 233). According to Hayri, modernity requires efficiency and interpreting, or even creating reality for one's own sake.

There is no clear reference to the exact historical setting of the novel; however, everything happens during the decade following Hayri's return from the Great War as a veteran. Tanpınar does not provide his reader enough details about the society, either. The novel is encapsulated within its characters and the Time Regulation Institute creating its own time as a strong allegory of the Republic of Turkey. In its multiple layers, the subtle approach to the social identity crisis that Turkey underwent, superstitions and their role in society, and the hallowing of science for the sake of modernity are prominent characteristics of the novel, which ironically makes it a modernist one.

Turkish literary critics, such as Berna Moran, often resort to the idea of belatedness when they discuss Turkish modernity. According to this view, Turkey was late to become modern, as Europe had been modernizing since centuries. During and after the Turkish nation building process, the notion of belatedness is often reflected in literature. Gregory Jusdanis argues that "in modernity, relationships drawn among nations inevitably reveal that most are technologically, culturally, and politically belated with regard to early modernizers. Those considering themselves or seen by others as backward have no choice but to try to search for models to copy. They turn to the national culture

as a means of catching up" (*The Necessary Nation* 102). However, Jusdanis elaborates that it gives a nation confidence to look at the glory of its precursors in the modern age "when one stands on a hill of illustrious traditions." Nevertheless, when a nation realizes the superiority and advancement of its contemporaries it feels threatened by its peers' successes and thus, "what intimidates the moderns is not the legacy of the ancients but the possibility of remaining ancient" (*Time* 103).

Analyzing Turkey under the light of Jusdanis's argument reveals a perspective that Turkish intellectuals had during the formative years of the nation. The successes and glories of the precursors (Ottomans), as defined by Jusdanis, did not consist a source of pride for many Republicans in Turkey. Thus, the *modern* nation-state did not have a source where it could reinforce its national pride. Moreover, its contemporaries, namely European countries, were relatively more advanced in various fields where modernism primarily functioned, such as technology, industry, and culture. Thus, the notion of belatedness Turkish intelligentsia felt turned into a recurring theme in modern Turkish literature. Tanpınar, although not entirely taken by this notion, shows how such perspective was destructive for the intelligentsia.

As the story develops, one sees that Tanpınar waved a cynical criticism of many of the cultural reforms that the Republic brought in order to modernize the new nation state. As discussed in the previous section, Tanpınar was not as supportive for the language purification as his contemporaries. He did not want to give up on words with Persian and Arabic origins, as he believed they enriched the Turkish language. This

approach reflected in his writings and brought him a considerable amount of criticism accusing him of being old-fashioned.

A native speaker of Turkish can identify the difference in Hayri's language in the latest Turkish editions of the novel[80] where he uses many words that are described as "öz Türkçe," meaning old Turkish. Someone who speaks modern Turkish and can read Ottoman-Turkish, however, would better identify such words that were ripped from the modern Turkish language. As the translators of Tanpınar's novel states in their note on translation, these nuances are not easy to reflect in English and knowing about the history of Turkish language it is important for readers, who read the novel in English to know to make better sense of Tanpınar's political stance about the language reform and how he chooses to reflect his position through his writing (xxii).

Tanpınar's discontent with the language reform informs the novel substantially. Sure enough, Tanpınar's brilliant satire starts with the language reform on its first page of the chapter "Great Expectations," when Hayri İrdal, the narrator and the protagonist of the novel, starts telling his story through his memoir:

> I have never cared much for reading or writing; anyone who knows me can tell you that. Unless you count Jules Verne or the Nick Carter stories I read as a child, everything I know can be traced to *A Thousand and One Nights*, *A Parrot's Tale*, the armful history books … (always skipping the Arabic and Persian words)... (3)

[80] *The Time* has been translated into modern Turkish and re-published in the 2000s so that people could, in fact, read the original language of Tanpınar's language. Without the translation, it would be hardly possible for a modern Turk to read and enjoy the novel. Looking at the language barrier that developed throughout the twentieth-century, I think one can say that Atatürk's language revolution succeeded.

Skipping Arabic and Persian words was the right thing to do for someone who approves the Republic's reforms rendering the new nation separate from its imperial cultural past. From the very beginning of the novel, the reader is introduced to a narrator "who describes himself as a detached reader and writer with limited control over his own language" (Ertürk 118). Critical of the purification of the language, Tanpınar shows the reader how such changes in language reflected upon a regular person's life. "All my life I've had to learn new words" complains Hayri, "I was obliged to renew my lexicon with revisions based on real-life experience" (184).

Throughout the novel, Tanpınar continues to ridicule the language reform when the mayor, who comes to see the institute to decide how the government funds will be distributed for the institute's practices, opposes to the title for the position of "head of office operations:" "In fact it's rather unfortunate to have to besmirch the institute with such a name. This is an era of pure and unadulterated Turkish" (254), the mayor says. As the years following the language reform proved, the pure Turkish that the state tried to create was not easy to attain.

Western influence under the name of modernism also influenced the Turkish language. This time, it was not the Arabic and Persian originated words, but transliterations of French and English words started to be used in the daily Turkish language. Tanpınar was disturbed by the increasing influence of words from European languages, mainly French, on modern Turkish. People were using Arabic and Persian origin words less and less to purify Turkish but ironically, transliterated French words were increasing day by day. Just as using *old* words considered backwardness and

associated with the fallen Empire, using French words was related to being modern and civilized while also connoting a certain social class among people. "Every age, every way of life, has its own disposition, its turn of mind and hard undeniable truths. An example. Without a doubt, is the word 'chauffeur,' a word that speaks of refinement, superiority, society, civilization. …It is one of the most prized acquisitions in the Turkish language. Say it with whatever accent you like: its meaning remains unmistakable" (142), states Hayri, indicating how the use of specific words comes with great implications.

The novel reflects the author's opinions on the main political and cultural issues that Turkey dealt with during its nation building process. The new nation needed a new history of origin that is *not* related to the Ottomans just as much as it needed a new language that is purely Turkish. The notion of origin is still an important issue in nationalistic ideologies and Turkish nationalist ideology during the formation years of the Republic used this notion to reinforce a sense of nationhood. As if proving Benedict Anderson's right about his claim nationhood being something that is invented, the Turkish Historical Association that Atatürk founded in 1931 aimed to clean up the past from what seemed detrimental to the creation of a bright future appropriate to the glorious past. This glorious past, however, was not located in the imperial history.

Yahya Kemal Beyatlı[81] argued that history had its dead and alive parts, and our history started with the Ottomans. This ideology was not welcomed during the initial days of the Republic. The motive of Turks coming from Central Asia had existed for

[81] Yahya Kemal Beyatlı was a leading Turkish poet and author, as well as a politician.

longer than other claims for Turkish origin. This notion gained popularity in the 1930s. The idea of an Islamic origin was not often or strongly pronounced until recently; it increased only after the 1970s when Islamic political groups gained more popularity. There were other claims in addition to those that claimed the origin in Central Asia or in the Ottomans. They claimed an origin in Sumerians and Hittites (Belge 4).

The fact that Republican Turkey wrote multiple stories of origin during the nation-building process is criticized through the arbitrariness and subjectivity of historical accounts in the novel. Tanpınar makes his distrust in historical accounts noticeable when he constructs his story around the book on Ahmet the Timely that needs to be written by an order from the authorities. Hayri does not know how he can write a book on an imagined historical figure. "Tomorrow I'll bring a few history books – they should help you with your work on Ahmet the Timely," says Halit to comfort him. "You'll see just how easy it's going to be" (*The Time* 285). However, it is not easy to convince Hayri who constantly questions the irrationality of writing such a book on a completely fictional character and claiming that it is historical: "… that's because there is no such a man. He's simply not there. There's no trace of such a man in all history! Show me one single document, just a mention of the name – that's enough!" bursts out Hayri. Dr. Ramiz answers: "That way of thinking is antiquated. History is at the disposal of the present. I can show you hundreds of papers on hundreds of topics, and they are all lies, so what's the difference?" (296).

According to Halit, changing the reality according to one's needs is the main philosophy of modernity. Halit expresses this idea repetitively throughout the novel:

> … you'll see that your book will be adored. You seem to be under the impression that it contains untruths. But that's not so. There is nothing you have done that is not true. Today's Ahmet the Timely is not a falsification: he is the very embodiment of truth. Do you know what would make him a falsification and a disaster? If he had actually lived at the end of the seventeenth century, if he'd entertained the ideas we've attributed to him, well, then that would be a lie. He would be in the wrong age. … It is a question of working with the century at hand and making him a man of his time. (313)

Halit continues: "In extending our movement to the past, you have intensified its forward momentum. In addition, you have shown that our forbears were both revolutionary and modern. No one can begrudge his past forever. Is history material only for critical thought? Can we not stumble upon someone from the past whom we love and enjoy?" (313). Tanpınar's made-up historical figure in this novel, Ahmet, The Timely, poses as a satire of how Republican attempts to historicize Turks on a fabricated history. As locating an origin of the Turks is considered to be highly complicated, an argument on an "essence" for the Turks is actually futile. Within the story of Hayri's memoir and the book he wrote on a made-up historical figure, Sheikh Ahmet Zamanı Efendi,[82] Tanpınar also gives his reader the actual stories of the cultural revolution from the alphabet change to the fabrication of national historical narratives that Atatürk's reforms included.

[82] The translation includes a mistake and translates Ahmet the Timely and Sheikc Ahmet Zamanı Efendi as the same historical figure.

Hayri's book on Ahmet the Timely, "the patron saint of clock makers" (4) is a fabrication that he and Halit Ayarcı create in order to convince the government agencies for continuous support for the Institute since they need to prove that the Institute is necessary for the modern nation. In the beginning, Hayri strongly opposes to the idea that he needs to write a book on this fictional historical figure; however, in time, he starts to talk about this figure in such a way that it suggests he has come to believe that the figure actually existed. "…for not only did Halit Ayarcı discover Sheikh Ahmet Zamanı Efendi at that precise moment; he also knew at once that this man belonged to the reign of Mehmed IV" (4). Through Ahmet the Timely, Tanpınar makes a cynical point about the untrustworthiness of historical accounts in particular to the Turkish case and makes the reader question what is told to be the reality of the past. Indicating a more general criticism of historical accounts, Tanpınar adds that the book that Hayri wrote translated into "eighteen languages, and the reviews it received in foreign newspapers" (5) and with this, he seems to invalidate the idea that international fame and success is a proof of authenticity.

The idea of distrust in the historical accounts of the past that the novel parodies continues to the modern accounts to show that the same subjectivity and unrealistic representation exist in the modern account as well. Tanpınar skillfully shows this through the reputation Hayri gains. Hayri's considerable public reputation through the Institution and the books he writes is highlighted. However, paralleling the fabricated history, most of the things he reads in the newspapers about himself have nothing to do with his reality. He reads in surprise "according to this article" about his childhood "clocks and time had

fascinated [him] since the age of three" (289). In such newspaper articles, he becomes "the heir of all knowledge – progressive and mystical – about Sheikh Ahmet the Timely" and creates headlines such as "our [Turks'] undiscovered Voltaire." Dr. Ramiz writes a book on him where he argues that Hayri is "a kind of Ebu Ali Sinan,"[83] and "nothing less than a modern reincarnation of this Eastern Faust" (287). Hayri is deeply disturbed by this great web of lies that now surrounds him. Halit, on the other hand, is pleased by the fact that they achieved public recognition. His reply to Hayri's complaints gives the reader a synopsis of the whole nation that is trying to catch up with the world around it: "Am I to blame because you resemble Faust or Voltaire? … People say such things because they want to see something special in us too. Do you think it is easy for a civilization carrying so much history on its back to catch up in just fifty years? … A novelist will be likened to Zola, and you will be compared with this or that philosopher" (289).

In a nutshell, Halit summarizes how Turkish people were trying to 'catch up' with modernity through following a European model to validate them in the world and the emulation of the absolute model for Turkish modernity: Europe and its culture. Tanpınar indicates how such comparison is destined to fail because it takes a questionable model instead of its legitimate precursor for building its modernity. Thus, the things that are taken as facts in modern Turkey and which would turn into "historical accounts" of future

[83] Avicenna.

are unreliable fabrications. By making such as point, Tanpınar questions the modernity and its historical accounts universally.

In the journal articles and in the interview his wife gives to a magazine, Hayri is recreated as a man that he is not. Although Halit tells Hayri that his wife gave him his "true identity" (292) with all the things about him in the interview and "… this should be a source of true happiness. A new life, a new man … And there is no other choice, as you won't be coming back a second time" (293), adds Halit. Reminding him the necessity for changing and becoming *new,* Halit asks him: "Haven't you had enough of your Eastern *makams*, the Acemaşiran and all that? Don't you feel for anything beyond a longing for the things of our past?" (294). Hayri falls into a stage where he thinks he is losing his mind. He feels no control over what is happening around him and to him. Tanpınar wrote *Time* when the modernism was at the top of the political and cultural agenda of the new nation state.

The example of Hayri's life is an ironic wake-up call from the author to the society. Hayri represents any individual that went through similar bewilderment during the 1930s and 40s. The situation that Hayri is in makes him question how people do not seem to realize that sane and insane switched places. In Hayri's surprise to his reaction toward all the things that are happening, Halit tells Hayri that he has "imprisoned [himself] in a web of baseless fears and paranoia" (294). Upon this, Hayri notes: "To him, my continuing doubts about the existence of Ahmet the Timely and my rejection of my wife's picture of me as a banjo-playing equestrian were all symptoms of the same malady" (295).

Halit and Dr. Ramiz continue to despise Hayri's resistance against becoming a man that he is not. Halit tells to Dr. Ramiz: "Today we live in what is called the modern world! And look at the state of those who deny it! We can't change them by force. May they be blessed with common sense? We, however, are in pursuit of real life!" (295). These words would sound familiar to anyone who had questions about what "the modern world" required them to give up and pick up. Hayri's confusion and resistance is mainly based on his difficulty to understand why he needs to act as if he were somebody else and he needed to give up his real identity behind in order to become compatible with the modern world. Hayri feels dazzled by the point at which he has arrived: "I had become a confabulation and the term of my sentence was indefinite: my life was presented to me in daily installments like a serial in a magazine" (279). This statement summarizes how it felt to adapt to the modern man for an ordinary man with very little education during the modernization of the country. Nothing felt original for the ordinary man.

When Hayri is not able to change the minds of Halit or Dr. Ramiz and any other people around him, for that matter, the reader starts to see the signs of his giving in to his new life, as well as its requirements. Hayri comes to a point where he believes in the lies knowing that they are lies and embodies the new identity that is given to him by the modern world. His change is clearly seen in his opinions on the book he is writing:

> …sadly I was no longer the same man. Over the six months I'd spent working on the book, I'd come to see the world through Halit Ayarcı's eyes, so much so that I found any objection to my work intolerable. It was now, after all, a question of an

> author's pride; and I had grown very fond of Ahmet the Timely. To doubt his existence at this late date would be far too troubling" (315).

He continues to express his changing thoughts about the Time Regulation Institute as well: "… I no longer harbored doubts about the Institute. I had slowly but surely come to believe what Halit Ayarcı so long insisted: that the institute was a viable modern organization conducting truly indispensable work (389). Willpower overcomes knowledge in Hayri's story, proving Halit right in his argument that the modern world is run by willpower and not by knowledge (359). The acceptance of this fabrication echoes the acceptance of a modernity borrowed from the West. Thus, it reinforces the allegory of the novel.

Time reveals valuable information about the attitude toward the imperial heritage during the period of the novel. Being critical of modernization project of the Republic, Tanpınar ridicules the social practices attempted for the sake of modernity and underlines the ignorance of those who welcome unexamined westernization and who refuse to get informed about the Ottoman past. It is known that during the first decades of the Republic, nation building process included authors writing books for the public with directions from the authorities. A new literature had to be created to make the new Turk feel belong to the new nation. Although such books did not promote any connection with the Ottoman past, they attempted to write down the history of the Turks, which was not based on facts. Tanpınar replicates such attempts in the example about Ahmet the Timely. Hayri is *ordered* to write a book about Ahmet Zamanı Efendi, *The Life and Works of Ahmet the Timely*, "The eminent seventeenth-century scholar. He lived during

the reign of Mehmed IV our golden age" (278). Ahmet the Timely never existed and both Hayri and Halit know that when they come up with the name before the mayor. It is again the mayor that gives Hayri a deadline to complete his book: "Hayri Bey, this book must be finished by the end of February. I want the completed book from you by then and this is an order. It's just not right for us to have neglected such an important person from our past" (279). Now, given the order by the representative of authority, Hayri has to write the book on a nonexistent historical figure to teach Turkish people about their past.

Everything Hayri says about this constructed historical figure sounds important to the mayor who does not know the reality. When the mayor asks Hayri if the period of Mehmed IV (1648 – 1687), during which Ahmet the Timely lived, was an important one and admits that he knows "very little about [his] forebears," Hayri goes on to inform him with an equivalent degree of ignorance as the mayor: "The age – it was an extremely important age. There was, of course, a tremendous interest in the mechanical. Almost everyone was busy, inventing things, in ways great and small. People were flying from one minaret to the next" (280). This reference to the past sounds unrealistic; however, none of the parties engaging in the conversation has the knowledge of history to disprove such inaccurate claims about the past. In fact, the reign of Mehmed IV is not considered "the golden age" of the Ottoman Empire. Although it experienced a brief revival of the Ottoman power, the reign of Mehmed IV is marked by the severe consequences of political and military casualties including that of The Battle of Vienna.

Despite being in favor of embracing the Ottoman heritage, Tanpınar did not aim to encourage people to believe in inaccurate accounts about the Empire but accept the

imperial heritage with its weaknesses and flaws. Such an approach, which is visible in Tanpınar's various works including *Time*, shows how cautious he was against being branded as a supporter of 'backwardness' that the Empire was often associated with. Thus, the above quote where Hayri clearly exaggerates the advances that the Ottomans enjoyed glorifies the Empire in an overlooking and ignorant way. Hayri keeps telling the mayor trivial details about the life and personality of Ahmet the Timely such as how his master Nuri Efendi told him that Ahmet the Timely ate "nothing but grapes" and "wore yellow robe and a yellow fur coat" and added that he was "opposed to the custom of taking more than one wife …". With this information, the mayor concludes the man was "a modern man! Practically one of us!" (280 – 281).

Western Orientalism and Turkish self-orientalism are not spared from Tanpınar's criticism. Knowing that the Ottoman way of life is considered authentic and exotic, especially in Europe, Hayri's current modern house setting carries a touch of the Ottoman world for the sake of reinforcing the distinction that Republican *modern* Turkey strongly wanted to make between the old and new Turkey. "…our Arab *kalfa*, Zeynep Hanım, for whom we searched far and wide, suffering a thousand hardships, just to give our home that taste of the old world – how strange that blacks are now as rare as imported goods while in my childhood there were so many of them in Istanbul" (6). While indicating what self-orientalizing mentality of the Turks in Republic can do for the sake of *looking* Eastern – just to despise it –, Tanpınar also underlines how modern Turkish society became homogenized after the Republic since with the rise of Turkish nationalism

various ethnic groups that lived under the rule of the Empire were often forced to leave Istanbul.

Criticism of Republican reforms is craftily scattered throughout the novel. Hayri gives a brief analysis of how watches and clocks are, in fact, as the society itself and weaves this idea into the metaphor of the Turkish clothing reform:

> …watches and clocks… inevitably fall in step with an owner's disposition, be it ponderous or ebullient, and in the same way, they reflect his conjugal patterns and political persuasions. Certainly in a society like ours that has been swept along by one revolution to another in its relentless march toward progress, leaving behind diverse communities and entire generations, it is all too understandable that our political persuasions would find expression in this way. …With so many sanctions hanging over us, no one is about to stand up in public and proclaim, "Now, this is what I think!" or even to say such a thing aloud, for that matter. Thus, it is our watches and clocks that hold our secrets, as well as the beliefs and habits that set us apart from others. …Without going into too much detail, I can say that we find this same tendency – to assimilate and adapt – in all our personal belongings… Do not our old hats and shoes and clothes become more and more a part of us with the passage of time? Isn't that why we are constantly trying to replace them? A man who dons a new suit leaves his old self behind. How different it looks, as it recedes into the past! What bliss to exclaim, "I am at last a new man!" (12)

As a part of the social revolution, the law that required certain regulations for clothing was introduced in the 1920s. The goal was to dress like Europeans and abolish traditional clothing that was often associated with certain Islamic religious practices and organizations. The Hat Law of 1925 required state employees to wear Western style hats instead of "fez;"[84] the wearing of hats gradually spread to civil servants and civilians as well.

A series of laws progressively limited wearing certain clothing pieces based on religion, such as veil and turban. Tanpınar points out how reforms did not only make simple changes in clothing but meant elimination of certain ideas and traditions while promoting others: "To assimilate and to adapt – in all our personal belongings…" reflects how Tanpınar expresses his dissatisfaction with such laws that were imposed on individuals through the "relentless march toward progress" (12). Tanpınar uses clothing as a great metaphor[85] in his novel and shows how clothing is related to one's identity and how it reflects who one is – as well as who one is not, for that matter –. With these reforms, dressing like Europeans became a trend among elite groups. Such groups did not want to dress as their predecessors did but as a modern man does. However, such superficial understanding and practice of modernism, in other words, westernization,

---

[84] Fez is a truncated cone-shaped hat that was worn mainly by Ottoman soldiers and politicians. Interestingly, Sultan Mahmud II, as an alternative to turban, introduced fez in the nineteenth-century when the Empire adopted Western style uniforms for its military officers and thus is was often considered to be a sign of modernity in the Ottoman society.

[85] A similar metaphor can be seen in Pamuk's *The Black Book*. In *The Black Book*, a craftsman who is not able to sell his mannequins because, with their dark complexions, and moustaches, they "resembled our own people," and they did not look like people from the West "who taught us style." What the customer wants is to "slip into a jacket worn by a new and beautiful person from a distant and unfamiliar land, so that putting on the jacket he can believe he, too, has changed and turned into someone else" (54)

understood superficially, treated both the Ottoman identity and being modern as if they were a piece of clothing to take off and put on in order to 'become' it. In the following quote by Hayri, Tanpınar emphasizes this mentality that mostly the elite groups and the intelligentsia of the 1940s and 50s embodied:

> I can claim comfortably that it is indeed possible to see in an old hat or a pair of shoes all the whims of its owner… This may help explain the conventional wisdom that new servants coming to work in our homes should be given some of our clothes... Thus the servant – someone with whom we are newly acquainted – will, after putting on a shirt and a tie and walking about in our shoes for a while, feel mysteriously compelled to adopt our idiosyncrasies and manners of thought, without ever knowing why. (12 – 13)

Tanpınar was aware that people often did not understand why they were doing what they were doing for the sake of modernity. In this particular passage, Tanpınar underlines the irrationality of the idea that one could attain the worldview and the mindset of the owner of the clothes, i.e. the West when one puts them on.

Tanpınar's extended metaphor of clothing continues in several scenes emphasizing its critical function for his narrative. Hayri goes on to explain two occasions where wearing suits made him embody the ideas of the owners of the clothes as if they were some verbal attires. In one of them, Halit advises Hayri that he should not wear his old clothes to the Institute and gives him a suit to wear. Hayri notes: "On the very first day I wore the suit, I sensed a dramatic shift in my entire being. New horizons and

perspectives suddenly unfurled before me" (13). With his modern suit on, Hayri *becomes* a modern man. His ideas and actions dramatically change:

> I began to use terms like "modification," "coordination," "work structure," "mindset shift" "metathought," and "scientific mentality;" I took to associating such terms as "ineluctability" or "impossibility" with my lack of will. I even made imprudent comparisons between East and West and passed judgments whose gravity left me terrified. Like him [Halit], I began to look at people with eyes that wondered, "Now, what use could he be to us?" …as if it were not a suit but a magic cloak. …In effect, I became a man whose thoughts, decisions, and speech patterns were all in jumble. (13 – 14)

All the new vocabulary, the way of dressing, seeing people as commodities to financially benefit from come as a consequence of *becoming modern* with a piece clothing. Through Hayri's comments on how new clothing changed him, Tanpınar ridicules the clothing reform. Tanpınar shows the irrationality of understanding superficial change as a way of becoming modern.

During a speech he gave on the hat and clothing reforms on August 27, 1925, Atatürk mentioned why modern Turks needed to change their clothing. In this speech, Ataturk said: "Biz her nokta-i nazardan medeni insan olmalıyız. Fikrimiz, zihniyetimiz, tepeden tırnağa kadar medeni olacaktır. Medeni ve beynelmilel kıyafet milletimiz için layık bir kıyafettir onu giyeceğiz. [86] [We have to be modern human beings in every

[86] May 28, 2014, kastamonu.gov.tr/ataturk.asp. Translation is mine. Kastamonu Speech is only one of the speeches that Atatürk gave after the proclamation of the Republic. Atatürk continued his visits to different

aspect. From head to toe, our ideas, our mind will be modern. Modern and international clothing is what our people deserve and we will wear them.]" While reforms interpreted as the symptoms of a top down modernism, to conclude that Atatürk's goal with the reforms, particularly the clothing reform, was simply to impose the Western lifestyle would be a simplification of his motivation for a modern society. My goal is not to undermine Ataturk's efforts for the Turkey he founded. Atatürk's implementations during the cultural revolution had consequences that transgressed his original intentions and that he could not foresee. Thus, I thoroughly acknowledge Atatürk's reasons for establishing the new Turkey out of foreign invasion and a dysfunctional Empire. In Tanpınar's novel and in my interpretation, the main criticism is intended toward Western modernity and its application in Turkey by the people more than it is toward Atatürk's goals as a leader. Tanpınar was aware that becoming modern was not something that one could attain by changing one's clothes. While Atatürk might have intended to utilize the clothing reform as the beginning of the nation's mindset toward modernity, the superficial understanding of becoming modern that was spreading around in the nation was destined to generate further cultural problems in the coming decades.

The proclamation of Republic came after the end of the Turkish War of Independence (1919 – 1923), which resulted in the victory of Turkey and freedom from its occupiers. The victory of independence, however, gradually led to a cultural loss that came with westernization and modernization. Hayri states:

---

cities in Turkey introducing and promoting new social reforms including the clothing reform that he was about to pass the law.

> The privilege I most treasured as a child was that of freedom. Today we use the word only in its political sense, and how unfortunate for us. … I have been made to understand that in my lifetime freedom has been kind enough to visit our country seven or eight times. Yes, seven or eight times, and no one bothered to say when it left; but whenever it came back again, we would leap out of our seats in joy and pour into the streets to blow our horns and beat our drums. … I must confess I've always found freedom an elusive concept. … This love of liberty is nothing more than a kind of snobbism. (18-19)

Hayri compares the concept of freedom from his childhood to the one that currently exists in the so-called modern life. The "political freedom" is not the only way to understand freedom. As a new nation-state, Turkey had its political freedom from its occupiers. However, the people of Turkey are tongue-bounded; they cannot speak or write in a language that they grew up with. They are stripped of their clothes that they have always worn and replaced them with someone else's clothes and are forced to learn to think like them, just as how they have to learn to dress like them. Hayri explains the difference between the freedom he knew when he was a child and the one he is experiencing as "The freedom I knew as a child was of a different kind. …I never chased after things I didn't need. I never wore myself out trying to fulfill doomed passions or ambitions" (19). The freedom, modern life claims to bring to people, comes with a great cost. It makes one imprisoned in his desires and ambitions for things that one does not need.

Hayri's first initiation to the ways of modern times comes with the watch his uncle gives him as a present on his circumcision day. This day marks a dramatic change in his life, as now, Hayri needs to adapt to the new way of understanding the concept of time:

> From the moment they placed it [the watch] on my pillow… my life changed, its deeper meanings suddenly emerging. First the little timepiece nullified my little world and then it claimed its rightful place, forcing me to abandon my earlier loves: I forgot about those two glorious minarets carved out of chipboard that my uncle had given me…my uncle always gave me such gifts, despite the fact that he gave his own children toys that were – to use words still relevant today – modern and secular. (21)

With this modern gift, Hayri starts to satisfy his desire to explore what is inside a watch and his apprenticeship in Nuri Efendi's shop helps him master the interiors and workings of watches and clocks. Nuri Efendi's disturbance by unregulated watches drives him crazy. This is also how the idea of The Time Regulation Institute is born. "An unregulated timepiece would drive this otherwise mild-mannered man to despair. As more and more clocks appeared around the city following the reestablishment of the Constitution in 1908, he would no longer set foot outside his shop for fear of 'exposure to an unregulated clock'" (32).

Time is understood as the very element of modern life that equates to money and success. This idea is the basis of how the Time Regulation Institute comes into being. Halit says:

> Regulation is chasing down the seconds. …Think about the implications of these words. We're losing half our time with unregulated clocks. If every person loses one second per hour, we lose a total of eighteen million seconds in that hour. …Now perform the calculations and see how many lifetimes suddenly slip away every year. …Can you now see the immensity of Nuri Efendi's mind, his genius? Thanks to his inspiration, we shall make up the loss. Therein lies the truly beneficial aspect of our institute. …You shall write the life of Nuri Efendi, a book in the European style. (33)

Although Hayri never wrote the book on Nuri Efendi, he wrote *The Life and Works of Ahmet the Timely*.

Halit, the prototype for the modern man, believes that to perform "real work" one needs an office and should have a modern understanding of time that is "regulated." As the Time Regulation Institute grows, more details about the satire on bureaucracy are revealed. Hundreds of employees of the institute practically do nothing as a supposedly modern man would do in any modern "institute." In the first chapter of the novel, Hayri tells the reader how he admires the late Halit Ayarcı. In praise of his personality and achievements, Hayri says: "I witnessed the Time Regulation Institute – perhaps the greatest and most important organization of this century – evolve from a sudden spark in his eyes to the splendor it enjoys today or did, rather yesterday" (7). Although in the following chapters, the reader witnesses Hayri's disbelief in the necessity of the Institute during its foundation years, when he was writing his memoirs after the death of Halit, Hayri has come to having a complete belief in the Institute. This change shows how Halit

presented him the ideas of modernity and claimed that such ideas show changed his values and the way he reasons things. He continues his praise for Halit for pages and asks himself: "What was your life before you met Halit Ayarcı? And what are you now?" (8), indicating Halit's significant role in his life. Tanpınar seems to be asking this question to the reader as well. The story of Hayri from poverty to prosperity is earned thanks to a modern institution that has no real benefit to the society but benefits from governmental sources and makes these two men as well as their families considerably rich. Through the Institute, Tanpınar shows how a unique opportunity is given to a crafty man who knows how to get his means thanks to the phenomenon of modernism. In reality, the Institute, which is claimed to be "the most innovative and beneficial organization in the world," does nothing to improve the society but staffing "not only [Hayri's] immediate family but also [his] close and distant relatives" (9).

The Ottoman Empire is certainly one of the pillars of this novel. For the author, buildings and characters are literary representations of the imperial past. Tanpınar treats these representations completely different from the general satire in the plot, creating a clear comparison in the narrative and haunting the reader with the remnants of a past through an empty children's room as his metaphor. While he parodies most of the modern practices, the children of the Empire abandon the house. The character, Abdüssellam Bey, an "old Istanbul aristocrat" (35), is such a character that represents good days of the Empire. "The extravagant lifestyle in an enormous villa," where he lives with "his entire tribe" and exquisite description of his pompous life in his mansion reminds the riches that the Ottoman elite enjoyed. He is also related to grand viziers or

marshals of the Empire through brides or daughters. Hayri marries Emine, one of the girls that were raised in his villa, with the help of Abdüsselam Bey. Abdüsselam Bey's villa was carried on in the same way until the declaration of the reinstated constitution. Following the World War I things start to change in his villa. "The splendor of his former villa, with its carriages and horses, its servants, and abundant comforts, was not yet a distant memory. But its denizens had dispersed" (80). With the Declaration of Independence, the villa began slowly to dissolve even more, a decline that in some aspects echoed that of the Ottoman Empire (37). Just as the diversity of the society dissolves, the villa's household also leaves one by one:

> Abdüsselam was deeply saddened by all this and could not understand how independence – which we had apparently all been longing for in secret – had deprived his home of the cheerful cries of children. …Abdüsselam was further confounded by all these distant relatives, whom he found as unreadable as texts whose principle sentences had been effaced or rendered indecipherable… (38)

Abdüsselam Bey's villa functions as a metaphor for the Empire's decline and its effect on individuals' lives. As the years pass, dozens of close and distant relatives living in Abdüsselam Bey's villa leave for different reasons, but mainly for the deteriorating financial situation of Abdüsselam Bey. The "children's room" (88) where Abdüsselam Bey kept the gifts he bought for the children of his relatives but never had the chance to actually give them to the kids, is a "mountain of meaningless castaway objects" (87). In Hayri's words "it was a room of remembrance and loss, piled high with farewells, with the dead stacked one on top of the other, where each of us could see the death of our own

childhood and youth" (88). The children's room symbolizes the end of a generation that will never come back, a perspective that somehow contradicts attempts to be "off-modernist." Hayri's childhood and youth during the relatively good days of the Empire are now gone forever. Although Hayri now considers himself a modern man, he cannot quite forget about Abdüsselam Bey, or the other characters from his past, such as Seyit Lutfullah and Aristidi Efendi who represent colorful personalities in their "European smile" and "European patience" (49 – 50). These people come from a part of Hayri's life when he was not yet introduced to the modern ways through Time Regulation Institute, yet. However, what makes Hayri the person he lies in his experience in the past with these personalities that shaped his life. The almost overnight foundation and growth of the Institute emulate that of the Republic, and Tanpınar speaks through an indirect analogy to explain how Hayri needs to tell his reader about his past so that they can understand his present better. Considering the tension about how the Republic wanted to eliminate the Ottoman past, the following quote from Hayri's memoir gains further meaning:

> I myself am now far too old to take pleasure in visits to the past or even, for that matter, from simple reminiscing. …I now feel distant from all these characters and long-ago events; a part of me has turned away from the past, though I still claim it as my own. But however I might regret it, I cannot explain myself without looking back. I lived among these men for years and with them chased after their dreams. There were times when I even dressed like them, adopting aspects of their personalities. Without my quite knowing, I would on occasion

> even *become* Nuri Efendi or Abdüsselam Bey or, yes, even Seyit Lutfullah. They were my models, the masks I hardly knew to be masks. …And still today when I look in the mirror I can see these men reflected in my face. …Perhaps this is what we mean by "personality": the rich array of masks we store in warehouses of our minds and the eccentricities of those who manifest themselves in our person. (50 – 51)

The dilemma between being modern and being Ottoman at the same time challenged the majority of the society during the foundational years of the Republic. Tanpınar puts it into Hayri's mouth how these two supposedly separate identities are, in fact, inseparable. No matter how 'modern' Hayri thinks he becomes, he still sees the identities of the past "reflected" in his face in the mirror. Hayri's new identity as a modern man is another "mask" that he puts on just like the new clothes he wears. Like many of his contemporaries, Tanpınar suffered from the in-betweenness of the Turkish individual during the Republic's foundational years when the great cultural revolution was taking place. Many Turkish people felt that they could neither become fully 'modern' in Western terms nor could they stay the same as the Ottomans. In the novel, Hayri becomes a reflection of such an individual. "For whatever reason, it is my past, and not my current position in life, that holds the key to my problems; I can neither escape from it nor entirely accept its mandate" (52). This cultural and psychological condition becomes a recurring theme in Turkish literature during the twentieth-century.

After as a youth working in Nuri Efendi's Time Workshop and losing interest in this position after a while, Hayri is introduced to "improvisatory theater groups" and

becomes a member of one of them before he is drafted into the army for World War I. In theater, Hayri gets the chance to *be* someone other than himself:

> The important thing was that my name was no longer Hayri and that I was able, for a time, to break free of reality's grip. In a word, it was an escape. I was living an enchanted world of lies and illusion and that was all I wanted. …It was the Great War that rescued me from the chaos of this strange and tiring world that largely eluded my understanding. With the war, it seemed I finally set my feet on firm ground. But as always it felt too late." (75)

Living someone else's life gives Hayri an "escape from reality" and lets him live a life that is full of "lies and illusions" in the world of theater. Ironically, it is a real historical event World War I that saves him from this life of illusion. The illusion Hayri was living in resonates a modern life that is staged and full of people, who are acting and trying to become someone else.

Turkish authors in the second half of the century widely wrote on how much the modern Turk could become modern. At the end of the century, Orhan Pamuk takes on the same theme more explicitly than any other writer. Following the line of Tanpınar, he capitalizes even more on the long-neglected issue of the Ottoman cultural heritage. Tanpınar grasps the heterogeneity of Turkish modernity, but he is never able to see it as generative and affirmative. He sees ruins and masks, which make political, personal and even artistic action difficult. Pamuk realizes the same issues as Tanpınar did but goes in a different direction, with no longing for a pure Turkish self.

In addition to cultural and emotional changes in the society, Hayri reflects the physical change of the city – in this case Istanbul –, which manifested the comprehensive nature of the cultural revolution and its influence on individual's life. Describing how old buildings are demolished and new buildings are constructed, Hayri speaks in favor of the modern architecture. However, what Tanpınar is skillfully injecting through Hayri's confession is how he tries to console himself for losing the pieces from his past:

> My fellow citizens should find some consolation when they see the new apartment buildings that now stand on those grounds [the grounds where an old *medrese* and a mosque once stood]. The neighborhood has sprung to life. The way things are developing we can expect an entirely modern neighborhood within a few years. I applaud the modern man, and I too enjoy modern comforts and modern architecture. (55)

For a reader who does not know much about Tanpınar's position on the social erasure of what belongs to the Ottoman culture, Hayri sounds sincere in his "applaud." However, the language Tanpınar chooses to use for Hayri to express his thoughts reveals that Hayri is, in fact, trying to console himself not to feel upset about the loss of the old *medrese* and the mosque, or the old cemeteries on which modern apartment buildings are built. Tanpınar knows that the "life" that "sprung" in the neighborhood is constructed on the cemetery of the past, as modern life "commands us to stay far from the notion of death" (56). Thus, it hides cemeteries, remnants of death, from people's sight.

Influenced by Bergson's philosophy, Tanpınar believed in the continuity of time and applied his philosophy in his argument on the imperial past and the Republican

present of Turkey. This, not surprisingly, conflicted with the attitude toward the Ottoman history that Republican Turkey promoted. In *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (1949), Tanpınar follows the Bergsonian continuity of time and reclaims the disowned Ottoman history with its failures and successes "as a part of a continuous historical development" (*Grammatology* 112). In *Time*, Bergson's notion of duration and memory can be recognized in Hayri's constant difficulty in adapting to his modern self which, according to Halit, he can only gain by leaving his old self completely behind. The past is also the bridge to the future for Tanpınar. Bergson explains the relationship between the past and the future as components of duration:

> To retain what no longer is, to anticipate what as yet is not, – these are the primary functions of consciousness. For consciousness, there is no present, … An instant is the purely rhetorical limit which separates the past from the future. … What we actually perceive is a certain span of duration composed of two parts – our immediate past and our imminent future. We lean on the past; we bend forward on the future … Consciousness is then, as it were, the hyphen which joins what has been to what will be, the bridge which spans the past and the future. (*Mind Energy* 9)

Considering Bergson's philosophy along with Tanpınar's understanding of past and present, I trace a similar philosophy guiding Tanpınar. He uses Bergson's logic about time and consciousness and projects it upon the imperial past and Republican present of Turkey and suggests that just as in Bergson's concepts of memory and duration, the Republic has to build upon the experience of the past as it is not logically possible to

refute the existence and experience of the past; the present is entirely built upon the past and the future will be built upon it as well. Bergson emphasizes the importance of the present as a hyphen. Similarly, Tanpınar offers a present that will be completed in the future after the hyphen.

Examples of superficial westernization do not remain at an individual level but contains the practice of modern sciences. Tanpınar makes a compelling use of this when he incorporates a satirical use of the practice of psychoanalysis to explain the Turkish case. The practice of psychoanalysis in the novel is used as a way to show how superficial understanding of science from the West caused comical interpretations. According to Hayri, after returning from Vienna to practice psychoanalysis in Turkey, Dr. Ramiz could not receive the funding "he would need to cure the entire nation with his miraculous practice" (*Time* 104). Though Dr. Ramiz, Tanpınar presents as another example of self-orientalism. Educated in the West, Dr. Ramiz, a Turk, looks at his country differently after he returns to it. "He liked nothing at all about our country. The mind-set of its people was démodé. …We had only to consider my own [Hayri's] situation to see how bad things really were in this country of ours" (104). Seemingly, no one knew or cared about psychoanalysis, as Dr. Ramiz had been unable to practice it since his return from Vienna. "In Europe, however, …the situation was quite different. There they had a respect for specialization; for them, psychoanalysis was as fundamental as their daily bread" (105). As Dr. Ramiz finally finds a "case" of psychoanalysis in Hayri, he goes on to decide that Hayri is ill and diagnoses him with "the father complex" (112). Tanpınar's use of the relationship between a father and a son seems to be

functioning as a metaphor for the relationship between the Empire and the Republic. This also implies the Bergsonian continuity in time:

> …with the death of your father, you should have achieved a certain freedom or maturity. The question now is how to free yourself of the consequences of this complex. Yet as the complex exists in the subconscious mind it's insignificant, as long as it remains the same – insignificant and, in fact, entirely natural, especially in today's society. For in today's world, almost all of us suffer from this condition. Just look around: we all complain about the past; everyone is preoccupied with it. This is why we seek to change it. What does this mean? A father complex, no? Don't we all, both young and old, wrestle with this very condition? Observe our obsession with the Hittites and Phrygians and God knows what other ancient tribes. Is this anything but a deep father complex? (118)

Ramiz's words criticize the desire to disown and change the past of the Turks. The "obsession with the Hittites and Phrygians" and other claims about the origins of the Turks are results of the complex, and a threat, according to Republicans, that the Empire poses for the new nation's identity. The new Turkey struggles to create an origin and a history for itself while disowning the imperial past and embracing Western modernism. Tanpınar chooses to express his position through psychoanalysis, a practice originated in the West.

Although Dr. Ramiz is not happy with the culture he is identified with, he is interested in the culture itself as if he were a foreigner to it. This provides an example to a group of intellectuals who are educated in the West and estranged to their own culture.

Just like Dr. Ramiz, these intellectuals can neither be entirely estranged nor can they identify themselves with the Turkish culture that resists western modernism. When Hayri tells Dr. Ramiz how their forebears had a book to interpret dreams, Dr. Ramiz becomes interested. However, he is not able to explain such interpretation of the things that people dream about scientifically. Therefore, he is not able to accept its validity. "Dr. Ramiz was always charmed by things were particular to our country, but they troubled him too – not because he had lived abroad for several years, but because they lit up the void he inhabited, suspended between two lives" (125).

On the day of his discharge from Dr. Ramiz's care when the court decides that he is "cured," Hayri has a dream that he thinks, would please Dr. Ramiz as a good one to psychoanalyze. The dream takes place in Abdüsselam Bey's villa, in the children's room. Hayri sees people from his past: Seyit Lutfullah, Aristidi Efendi, Nuri Efendi, and even Dr. Ramiz is in the room; "And all those people weren't really there, but I knew they were" (127). He looks into the "strange mirror" in the room, and he hears a shout behind him: "They're about to separate. Watch out!" (127). Terrified, Hayri screams: "Don't do it. Abort the plan. Don't do it!" However, it is done. Given no explanation, the reader is left to interpret what is done. Following this scene, Hayri sees a terrifying image of his wife Emine in the mirror, crying "Save me, save me!" Hayri cannot save her and she slowly disappears, and "A great gust of wind sent everything flying up into the air, and in less than an instant the roof was blown off the house, and the walls collapsed, and we were all swept away by the wind" (128).

Considering the context of the novel and Tanpınar's skillfully designed satire of the Republic, one particular interpretation of this dream could be described as a terrifying epiphany that Hayri perceives: the Ottoman heritage is gone. Abdüsselam Bey's villa is now blown up with the wind, and everything is destroyed. Now, Hayri only has Dr. Ramiz, a western educated Turkish intellectual, next to him, leading him, and none of the other people from his past, while walking down the cliff. Hayri already knows that it will not make a difference whether he reaches the brightly illuminated house at the end of the cliff, or not. It will never be the same as Abdüsselam Bey's villa. Failing to save this image in the mirror, possibly a personification of the culture he inherited from the Ottomans, Hayri, the modern man, is to blame, as the image screams: "This is all your fault" (128).

Part of the Republic's modernization attempts included bringing specialists from Europe to train the Turks in various fields from architecture to education.[87] The novel illustrates this practice to show its dysfunctionality. After his initial meeting with Halit Ayarcı, the seeds of the Time Regulation Institute are seeded. What starts as a little office

[87] Among many other scholars who came to Turkey during 1930s,[87] Leo Spitzer and Erich Auerbach are considered to have laid the foundations of comparative literary and philological work in the twentieth-century Turkey by establishing and leading Romance Languages Department at Istanbul University and publishing literary journals. Leo Spitzer founded the scholarly journal "Romanoloji Semineri Dergisi" [The Journal of Romance Philology Seminar] which could last only one year of publication. Eric Auerbach revived the Romance journal; he cofounded with Spitzer in 1947 and renamed it as *Garb Filolojileri Dergisi* [The Journal of Western Philology]. In the Preface to the Journal, Auerbach says, "We hope that this journal which we have started to reissue will serve the intellectual development of Turkey and continue the work that contributes to the study of international philology" (qt. in Konuk, p. 131). Moreover, Spitzer and Auerbach were the editors of Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi [The Journal of Istanbul University Literature Department] and published their own as well as their students' articles written in different languages, such as Turkish, German, French and English. For more information on Spitzer and Auerbach refer to Taşdemirci (1992), Göbenli (2005), Konuk (2010), Apter (2006).

grows into a big company with hundreds of employees till it comes to its "liquidation." Hayri is happy that he now has a job as the Head Secretary of the Institution, and no one can despise him anymore for not having one. A job but no work; an institution with no real function is how Hayri describes the Institution. When it comes to training the personnel with "foreign specialists," Halit firmly rejects the idea. It was a fact that the country was becoming increasingly "dependent on foreign specialization" (251). Halit's reaction to bringing foreign specialists is interesting because Halit is the representation of the modern man in the novel and he is the one who opposes a practice that was supported by the followers of Atatürk's modernism project:

> What have we become? Must we learn everything from them? Will the young boys of our country ever attain positions of real import? …
>
> 'If only we could be sure of their making a real difference,' the mayor continued, 'we might just be willing to make sacrifices …'
>
> Halit Ayarcı suddenly became stern:
>
> No sir. Our own people must train our personnel. Did we march all the way to the gates of Vienna with foreign specialists? In those days, everyone was a specialist because we had faith in ourselves. (251)

Hearing this conversation between Halit and the mayor, the narrator Hayri thinks: "Ah, such lofty language, such irrefutable analogies! Whatever could the mayor say in the face of Süleyman the Magnificent and his army of who knows how many hundreds of thousands not to mention their armor, their canons, their guns, and spears?" If the mayor is representing the opinion of the Republican government – he is the one who first

offered to invite foreign specialists –, even the mayor does not have absolute faith in the idea that bringing foreign specialists is the way to make Turks and their modern institutions become modern. "If only" he was "sure of their making a real difference," then he would insist further in favor of the idea, however, even *he* is not sure. Seeing that it is Halit, who thinks they do not need them, illustrates a conscious choice Tanpınar makes to show his reader that there are other ways to become modern than simply imitating what Europeans do. Moreover, it is Halit that refers to the Siege of Vienna that is considered to be a very particular historical moment with significant connotations in Turkish history.[88] Tanpınar points at the root of the problem that makes the modernization project so problematic and dependent on Western models. If Turks "had faith in" themselves just as their forefathers did modernization would have had a chance to become more efficient.

Just as Republicans were trying to build a whole new modern nation, Halit and Hayri builds the Institute. They create new practices that they have not heard before and

[88] The Ottoman Empire tried to capture the city of Vienna two times in 1529 and 1683, respectively. The first attempt is often referred in Western historical accounts as "The Siege of Vienna" while the second as "The Battle of Vienna" to differentiate between the two attacks. Neither of these two attempts resulted in success for the Ottomans. The Siege of Vienna took place during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent when the Ottoman Empire was experiencing the pinnacle of its political power. Although it did not end in the Ottomans' favor, the Siege marks one of the most significant points in the Empire's history due to its political connotations. It was a solid proof of the greatest extent of Ottoman expansion in central Europe. Never before this siege, the Ottomans had expanded this far in the continent. The two Viennese campaigns, in essence, marked the extreme limit of Ottoman logistical capability to field large armies deep in central and Western Europe at the time (Irwin 256). The news about The Siege created substantial concern in Europe. Many European countries that were fighting among one another due to sectarian problems united against the Ottoman Empire. The Battle of Vienna under the lead of Sultan Mehmet IV, however, is regarded the beginning of a long decline of the Empire although there are controversial opinions about that it is not as decisive in the political power of the Empire as argued. For more information, see Robert Irwin, "Islam and the Crusades 1096—1699" in *The Oxford History of the Crusades*. Tanpınar refers to The Siege of Vienna to remind the reader and the representative of the Republican government that the history of the Turks provides significant examples of success by itself.

make everything *new* and *modern* for the new and modern nation state. While showing the reader how the Institute comes into being gradually with a lot of modern practices and rules, Tanpınar emphasizes his criticism of the impact of modernism on individualism and diversity. Modernism, according to Tanpınar, is a kind of uniformity that erases individual differences and diversity of the society. First, they make uniforms for their employees and make sure that they all look the same. This would bring people's attention as "What would be the public think of the motley mass of people?" (264) Hayri adds. Additionally, Hayri thinks that their employees should not address their clientele in informal ways, such as "daddy-o, brother man, Uncle Tom …as if they've created this singular extended family!" (265). Then they teach them how to speak and what to say exactly and when to fall silent like "a kid of automaton" so their employees can be "just like alarms clocks, speaking when fixed to do so, …The human being on vinyl. Fantastic!" (265).

The goal of The Time Regulation Institute is to "chase down the seconds" and catch up with the modern time, but *Time* is the story of not being able to catch up, as "it felt too late" (75) and it is not done through a complete understanding of modernism. This 'belatedness' not only criticizes the Turkish version of modernism but also modernism itself while underlining the significance of a nation's cultural history if it wants to have a strong foundation to build upon. Otherwise, any attempt to so-called modernism is destined to experience the consequences of leaving behind the past, which embodies the content necessary for regeneration that the Turkish modernism aimed to attain.

Tanpınar's recent translations suggest that the Ottoman past and Turkish modernism need to be reexamined through the perspective of literary neo-Ottomanism so that the global reader can question the ramifications of cultural and historical accounts about the Turkish case.

Chapter 4

The Ottoman Theme in the Turkish Novel: The Case of Orhan Pamuk

This chapter lays out the cultural and literary changes that modern Turkey experienced after the end of the Empire through the Turkish novel. It traces how Orhan Pamuk, one of the major representatives of twentieth-century Turkish literature presents the dilemma of being modern and maintaining a cultural connection to the Ottomans at the same while these two things were understood as incompatible binaries by the state ideology. This chapter particularly focuses on how Pamuk's approach to the Ottoman theme reveals the quandaries of the modern Turkish identity that the break with the Ottoman cultural past mainly caused. Such analysis aims to answer how the cultural heritage of the Empire shaped twentieth-century Turkish literature and the ways in which it influences the determinants of Turkish status within world literature. Mainly through the international fame that Pamuk attained, Turkish literature has recently been recognized in world literary canons. While I do not discuss the variables of such canons in this chapter, I suggest that through the perspective of literary neo-Ottoman that authors Pamuk and Tanpınar employ, modern Turkish literature brings a cosmopolitan

perspective from a seemingly local national literature that offers a new mode of reading world literature.

Orhan Pamuk is one of the most prolific contemporary Turkish writers and probably the most well known around the world. The question 'What makes him so famous?' receives various and often contradicting answers from literary critics and scholars both in Turkey and around the world. While the rest of the world mostly praises his intellectuality and his writing skills, textual and literary innovations, over the years, he has received a considerable amount of criticism, mostly from Turkish literary critics and politicians. All the same, not all the attention Pamuk received from Turkish intellectuals has been negative. The Turkish author and translator Güneli Gün, who translated two of Pamuk's books,[89] was one of the first people to emphasize the writer's appeal to world literature even before Pamuk was well known around the world:

> Orhan Pamuk takes his own portrait of the artist very seriously indeed as he well should. After all, he's being touted as Turkey's new literary prodigy, putting in a timely appearance on the world literature scene. …Pamuk has his finger on the pulse of world literature. While his compatriots are still tinkering with the secrets of the well-made modern novel, Pamuk has already graduated into postmodernism. He is part of what might be termed the New International Voice – like Isabel Allende, for example, who too must not be the only good writer in Chile, although she's the one we buy and read, in translation. (Gün 60)

[89] Pamuk's two novels that Güneli Gün translated are *The Black Book* (1994) and *The New Life* (1997).

Considering that in 1992, Pamuk had only four novels, and only *The White Castle* (translated in 1994) out of those four had been translated into English, Gün's prophetic comment on Pamuk's prospective claim for a name in world literature renders quite felicitous, considering Pamuk's place in world literature today.

The interview Pamuk gave to Peer Teuwsen for *Das Magazine* in 2005 started a controversial and heated debate in Turkey about Pamuk's take on the nationalistic understanding of "Turkishness." In the interview, Pamuk made a statement about the Armenian question that divided Turkish historians, politicians, and readers. As a result of the debates following the interview, Pamuk was charged for 'insulting Turkishness' and an avalanche of criticism fell on the writer from Turkish nationalists. The range of criticism Pamuk received was considerable:

> Extreme commentaries accuse Pamuk, a secular Turk, of being a Jewish convert, or *dönme,* of opposing Kemalism, of being entrepreneurial, apolitical, a comprador, a bourgeois elitist, a commodifier of literature, of being in the service of foreign lobbies or conspiratorial networks, and of selling out his country for personal gains. As a corollary, his writing is often dismissed out of hand. He is accused of writing for non-Turkish (Euro-American) audiences, of writing in dense prose that his readers can't fathom or finish, of writing ungrammatically, of orientalism, and even of plagiarism. (Göknar, *Orhan Pamuk* 16)

From the early years of his career as a writer, Pamuk has often been a target for criticism. However, his statements about the Armenian issue in the interview[90] turned him into a lightning rod in Turkey. Most of such criticism was generated at the national level and reverberated in international literary as well as human rights platforms quite differently. International reaction to Pamuk's case criticized the charges against Pamuk and argued that the charges against Pamuk show that there is no freedom of speech in Turkey.[91]

All these discussions around his name served just the opposite of what Pamuk wanted for himself as a writer. Turkish literary critic Murat Belge underlines Pamuk's approach to his own literary identity:

> What distinguishes Orhan Pamuk from most other Turkish writers is that for him the activity of writing is a mode of existence. ... It is not so much a matter of the degree of commitment, but rather the form of it – his way of defining, limiting and specifying himself as 'a writer,' first and foremost. (qt. in "Author Profile," *World Literature Today*, 1996)

As a writer, who has transcended the national borders of both his literary and individual identity, Pamuk was disturbed for being identified with the Turkish nation itself on the world literary stage. "Pamuk has expressed his discomfort for being identified as a Turkish author rather than a novelist per se." It is even more unfortunate that "Pamuk

---

[90] In the interview, Pamuk stated: "one million Armenians were killed in these lands and nobody but me dares to talk about it." He also repeated his statement in the award ceremony of Peace Prize of the German Book Trade in October 2005: "I repeat, I said loud and clear that one million Armenians and 30,000 Kurds were killed in Turkey." November 1, 2013, news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4369562.stm.

[91] Eight world-renowned authors – José Saramago, Gabriel García Márquez, Günter Grass, Umberto Eco, Carlos Fuentes, Juan Goytisolo, John Updike and Mario Vargas Llosa – issued a joint statement and supported Pamuk. They stated that the charges against him as a violation of human rights. "Literary World Backs Pamuk." November 6, 2013, arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/353692.asp.

striving to transgress his own 'Turkishness' refuses to be pigeonholed from a nationalistic perspective"– during the Teuwsen interview that caused him to be charged for "insulting Turkishness" (*Orhan Pamuk* 2 – 4). In 2006, when these discussions were still current, the Swedish Academy announced that Pamuk had been awarded the Nobel Prize in literature, which was interpreted by Pamuk's critics as a politically motivated choice. The Nobel Prize significantly increased the reputation Pamuk had around the world bringing him closer to the realm of world literature. The charges against the author that put Turkey at odds with its candidacy for the European Union membership were dropped on January 23, 2006, but controversial thoughts about the author have never ceased.

In his works, Pamuk mainly writes about the intricacies of identity and identification, East-West interconnections, flaws of Turkish modernity, self-orientalism of the Turkish elite, doubling and doppelgangers, ethnic hybridity, and the Ottoman past. Among Pamuk's leitmotivs, the Ottoman theme serves as a thematic arc in many of his works. For Pamuk, the different historical epochs, namely the post-modern, secular Turkey and the Ottoman Empire are not two separate worlds. For the author, it is, in fact, just the opposite; they are inseparable.

The revival of the Ottoman theme within contemporary Turkish literature can be attributed to the works of Orhan Pamuk, whose intriguing use of the Ottoman past has received considerable interest both in Turkey and around the world. Historically, the resurrection of the Ottoman theme coincides with the post 1980-coup era in Turkey, when all sorts of political, social, and cultural transformations led to drastic changes and an increasing questioning of the secular Kemalist ideal of a nationalistic and modernist

historiography[92]. The period can roughly be defined as a manifestation of postmodern ideas in Turkish literary and cultural context. Various definitions of postmodernism include the idea that postmodernism is a rejection of 'meta-narratives,' "large-scale theoretical interpretations purportedly of universal application" (Harvey 9) While Jean-François Lyotard defines it as "incredulity toward metanarratives" (xxix), Terry Eagleton describes the relation between metanarratives and postmodernism, which becomes helpful when considering the Turkish context:

> Post-modernism signals the death of such 'metanarratives' whose secretly terroristic function was to ground and legitimate the illusion of a 'universal' human history. We are now in the process of awakening from the nightmare of modernity with its manipulative reason and fetish of the totality, into the laid-back pluralism of the post-modern, that heterogeneous range of lifestyles and language games which has renounced the nostalgic urge to totalize and legitimate itself. (Eagleton 194)

Especially during the 1970s, Turkish writers started experimenting innovative ways of literary production. During that period, the repercussions of Turkish modernism and the cultural revolution began to be acknowledged more pronouncedly by the main intelligentsia. Parting with the Turkish metanarratives, writers, such as Orhan Pamuk and Oğuz Atay diverged from social-realist writing that their predecessors practiced. Such literary experiments were identified with 'postmodernism' in different literary and

[92] Turkey experienced three coups (1960, 1971 and 1980) during the twentieth-century. However, the most brutal one was the 1980 coup, which "which saw 650,000 people detained, more than a million and a half placed under surveillance, and fifty executed by 1988" Nergis Ertürk "Turkish Fragments." November 12, 2013, www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/7810/turkish-fragments.

cultural contexts. Although Eagleton's description of the phenomenon brings some insight, within the Turkish context, the term becomes explanatory only when it is defined in a more precise fashion:

> [Postmodernism] can be further described and specified as expressions of post-Kemalism, postsocialism, and, most importantly, neo-Ottomanism. …postmodernism in Turkish literature was a movement of *re*writing and excavating the model forms of the previous fifty years. …it forecasted the shortcomings, failures, and idealism of various projects of modernization. Neo-Ottomanism implied a reassessment and reappropriation of disregarded cultural history and identity before World War I, including manifestations of Islam. (Göknar, "Orhan Pamuk" 35)

Thus, postmodernist writing in the Turkish context describes its reflection on its own past. Pamuk has led other contemporary Turkish writers to think and write more about the Ottoman past through both the international recognition he receives and his novels that are saturated in rather cosmopolitan Ottoman context. Pamuk's works present a more prominent example of the recent interest in the Ottoman context than other Turkish writers. However, one needs to acknowledge the modernist writer Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's preceding role on Pamuk's framing of the neo-Ottomanism and recognize that Pamuk's use of the theme mostly stems from Tanpınar.

Two out of eight of Pamuk's novels, *The White Castle* (1994, originally 1985) and *My Name is Red* (2001, originally 1998), pays a considerable tribute to the Ottoman Empire presenting it, as a culturally rich world. This approach offers a significant

revision of the predominant view that had been prominent in Turkey toward the Empire signaling the author's consideration of the Ottoman past as an inseparable part of contemporary Turkish culture. These two novels present the beginning of a new way to challenge the Republican master-narrative about secular modernization, which casts the Ottoman legacy and Islamic tradition as a hindrance to the Republican understanding of Turkish modernity. By questioning the Republican nationalist master-narrative and historiography and by reconnecting with the Ottoman cosmopolitan cultural history on a global scale, Pamuk opens Turkish literature to the world. A close analysis of these two novels in this chapter facilitates understanding the reasoning behind my argument about why the Ottoman theme used by writers like Pamuk should be perceived as a leading force for Turkish literature's presence in world literature today.

A Rewritten Story from the Ottoman Archive: *The White Castle*

...to see everything as connected with everything else is the addiction of our time.

-- Orhan Pamuk, *The White Castle*, 12

I have learned by experience that there are many ways to read a novel. We read sometimes logically, sometimes with our eyes, sometimes with our imagination, sometimes with a small part of our mind, sometimes the way we want to, sometimes the way the book wants us to, and sometimes with every fiber of our being.

-- Orhan Pamuk, *The Naive and the Sentimental Novelist*, 4

The history of the Ottoman Turkish world is a recurrent theme in the contemporary Turkish novel, which takes up an epoch of world history in the hope of situating its literary representations in the landscapes of world literature. The particular cultural context of Turkey leads to a better understanding of the Turkish works that are in circulation the world. Contemporary Turkish authors understand world literature as a literary space in which Turkish representations of its cultural identity can be redefined globally. Novels of Tanpınar and Pamuk, particularly the ones that are circulating around the world today, revise local presumptions of that which constitutes a modern Turkish identity and instead of offering a simple remedy for the issue of national identity, they invite readers, both local and global, to consider various components of such definitions. Orhan Pamuk's "Ottoman novels" entail a revised approach to the Ottoman past that invites readers to question both national and transnational accounts of Turkey while also presenting a cosmopolitan Ottoman-Turkish world. *The White Castle* shows the healing

of a nationalist literature through its cosmopolitan past and by so doing, provides a critical example of the modern Turkish novel's transformation from a nationalist genre to a cosmopolitan one.

In *The White Castle*, Pamuk begins to resurrect the world of the Ottomans, a topic that was to become an increasing fascination for Turkish readers during the decades following the publication of the novel. The novel is significant in terms of the various ways in which it "establish[es] the author, as Turkish scholar Erdağ Göknar argues, as an 'intellectual,' and provide[s] the first indication of his stature as an international writer" ("Orhan Pamuk and the 'Ottoman' Theme" 35). According to Göknar, the novel marks the beginning of a "postsecular" trend in Turkish literature. He states that it created "the possibility of a cosmopolitan transnational literature situated in Istanbul" (*Orhan Pamuk* 116). Göknar defines postsecular literature as a move away from Turkish nationalism and as a challenge to Kemalist ideals, as well as being a confirmation of the repercussions of the secularist project that governed the cultural and literary world in Turkey during the twentieth-century. Building upon Göknar's approach to the novel, I argue that *The White Castle* not only makes a radical departure from nationalist approaches in Turkish literature and contests the ideas of national and cultural identity as seen in Republican ideology, but it also situates modern Turkish literature beyond its national borders.

The novel presents the Ottoman Empire as a culturally rich and highly diverse world that resists the homogenizing impulse, which tends to accompany nationalist ideology. The novel offers a significant revision of the predominant Republican Turkish national view of the Empire, signaling the author's consideration of the Ottoman past as

an inseparable part of the contemporary Turkish culture. It represents the beginning of a new way of challenging the Republican master-narrative of secular modernization, which casts the Ottoman legacy and the Islamic tradition in the role of a hindrance to the Republican understanding of Turkish modernity. By questioning the Republican nationalist master-narrative and historiography, and by reconnecting with the Ottoman Empire's cosmopolitan cultural history, Pamuk opens Turkish literature to the world via translations. Through a close analysis of this novel, I suggest that the Ottoman theme, as used by Pamuk, should be perceived as one of the leading forces for the considerable presence of Turkish literature in contemporary world literature.

The Ottoman theme occupies a significant part of Pamuk's oeuvre; however, his corpus is not historical fiction mainly due to his narrative innovations in which he intentionally distorts historical facts. The Ottoman past does not permeate the present. Nonetheless, *White* shows how the present must be viewed in comparison with the past and shows that Turkey cannot be imagined without its embedded connection to the Ottoman past. Recognizing not only the glories but also the atrocities of the fallen Empire in his novels, Pamuk has initiated a literary platform on which imperial resonances are becoming louder with every attempt, past or present. To silence or to deliberately ignore the Ottoman cultural heritage and to think of separate from the present Turkey does not seem to be possible anymore due to increasing emphasis on the Ottoman past. Thus, literary neo-Ottomanism does not stem from an acknowledgment of the sameness of the past and the present. On the contrary, it promotes, as Natalie Melas describes in her book *All the Difference in the World: Postcoloniality and the Ends of Comparison* (2007), a

"dissimilation, [which] might be understood not only as alienation but also as a mode of relation that does not depend on the recognition of sameness. …there is ground for comparison but no basis for equivalence" (xiii). Dissimilation becomes useful in understanding the relation between the Ottoman past and the Republican Turkey. One cannot find equivalence between the two, but should make use of what can be gathered from a comparison between the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey, which becomes necessary in order to fully understand the latter. What are the grounds for comparison in a globalized text, such as Pamuk's *The White Castle*?

The setting of *The White Castle* is Ottoman Istanbul in the seventeenth-century. The story begins with the narrative of a young Venetian scholar on his way to Venice, his hometown. He is captured by Turkish pirates and imprisoned in Istanbul. He convinces his captors that he is a doctor. Managing to heal many people, he wins the trust of the pasha who gives him to one of his friends as a slave. The friend of the pasha is a scientist called Hodja, meaning "master" in Turkish. They spend over a decade together, during which Hodja wants to learn everything about the West from its science to its art. Hodja promises the young Venetian slave that when he learns everything about the West, he will be freed from slavery.

When read closely, the setting of the novel places it in a profoundly compelling state than its germane contribution to the story. Opening with a mock "Preface" to the novel, the narrator Faruk Darvinoğlu (son of Darwin), a secular intellectual, discovers a captive's tale dating from the seventeenth century in the Ottoman archive. In the Preface, Pamuk situates the Republican historian narrator in "that forgotten 'archive.'" The

narrator hints to the reader that he is about to reveal something different from what the reader might assume about "the archive," namely that it is full of boring documents, recording "imperial decrees, title deeds, court registers and tax rolls" (*White* 9). In fact, the Preface provides a two-fold recognition for the reader of the 1980s Turkey, in that not only a fictional story is about to be told, but the novel will also remove the dust on the Ottoman past placed by the period during which Republican metanarrative neglected the Ottoman past. "The dreamlike blue of its [the captive tale's] delicate, marbled binding, its bright calligraphy, shining among the faded government documents, immediately caught my eye" (9), says the narrator foreshadowing that the reader is about to witness something intriguing.

The elaborate physical description of the book that the narrator describes indicates that Pamuk wants his readers to imagine the book as an Ottoman-Turkish narrative. The "faded government documents" are not the only things that the archive can offer to the keen eye of the narrator, or to readers who are curious about the past. The Ottoman Empire is more than what the Republican historiography presented it to be: An anti-modern, and unimportant past. The negligence regarding the preservation of the past is palpable: "I read the book at once, with pleasure. Delighted, but too lazy to transcribe the manuscript, I stole it from the dump that even the young governor dared not call an 'archive,' …and slipped it, in the twinkling of an eye, into my case" (9). The implied neglect and lack of protection of the Empire's historical heritage are demonstrated through the ease that one can steal it from the archive.

The mock Preface is somewhat suggestive of Pamuk's approach to fiction writing and various accounts of history as a whole. The two are intertwined, but the Preface also reveals the way in which the author wants the reader to interpret the underlying frame of the story. The narrator explains, "My distrust of history then was still strong, and I wanted to concentrate on the story for its own sake, rather than on the manuscript's scientific, cultural, anthropological, or 'historical' value" (9). While warning the reader that this story found in the archive might not have actually taken place, the fictional writer of the story also satirizes the Republican historiography that has been taught to and by the twentieth-century Turkish intelligentsia. He indicates that rewriting of the past is problematic and is often inaccurate in the Turkish case, in which contemporary ideology is biased against the past, and where there is a language barrier:

> My readers will see that I nourished no pretensions to style [sarcasm of the imitation of western literary styles by Republican intelligentsia] while revising the book into contemporary Turkish: after reading a couple of sentences from the manuscript I kept on one table, I'd go to another table in the other room where I kept my papers and try to narrate in today's idiom the sense of what remained in my mind. (12)

The scene is carefully constructed to emphasize the multiple layers and arbitrariness of the action the narrator is undertaking. The two different languages, Ottoman-Turkish and modern Turkish, as well as the two different historical time periods (the time of the story in the story – the seventeenth-century – and the time of the mock author), consist part of the duality described in the scene. The narrator of the mock Preface is also a writer that

takes the reader in another layer of the story. The two different rooms, in which the fictional translator of the story recomposes and rewrites a supposedly "factual" story from the archives, parodies historical writing and shows the reader the arbitrary nature of such historical accounts. The story the narrator is composing is one that is "in today's idiom" with a sense of "what remained in [his] mind," which illustrates a metaphor for the historical and cultural connection that the translator/rewriter of the story is trying to create between the Ottoman past and modern Turkey through a *fictional* translation. Translation, for Pamuk, is neither creative nor entirely faithful and is formed in the mind of the 'rewriter,' creating new realities and transmitting existing ones simultaneously. Through such translation, Darvinoğlu shows "that the geographies that are crossed through translation are not just linguistic but political and social, historical and psychological. They involve navigating and trying to escape incarcerating discourses of Orientalism and nationalism" ("Orhan Pamuk" 36). In addition to the example in the Preface, Pamuk continues to present the concept of imagination through which the writer reconstructs reality throughout the story.

What is considered 'reality' in a historical account is deconstructed by Pamuk's narration through Darvinoğlu. In this scene, the narrator is creating his own reality with "what remained" in his mind from a source, which might have also been written by its original author with what remained in his mind. The idea that the novel has its own reality represents Pamuk's approach to the genre of the novel in his other works, too. In *The Black Book*, the narrator Galip's final words are: "After all, nothing can be as astounding as life. Except for writing. Yes, of course, except for writing, the sole

consolation" (400). This closing statement suggests how Pamuk understands writing, particularly the novel writing as the sole practice that releases the novelist from the real world. Pamuk's novels are radically different from the social realist novels of his Turkish predecessors, as Pamuk seems to think that a good novel does not simply reflect reality but creates its own.

Revising Tanzimat and Republican realism, which plagued early Turkish novel by forcing authors to include the folk spirit into the form of a modern novel, Pamuk's novel uses traditional narrative aesthetics. Pamuk takes this a step further by eliminating realism while developing the Ottoman spirit. A blend of historical accuracy with inaccuracy together with the novelist's imagination creates Pamuk's characters but, at the same time, redeems Pamuk's works from being historical novels. Pamuk has been an ardent opponent of the dry depiction of reality in novels and his representations of reality are usually transformed by imaginative, aesthetic and stylistic narrative methods rather than relying on simple, realistic descriptions. For Pamuk, the real art is only possible via the imagination of the artist that restructures reality. Similarly, Pamuk reconstructs the Turkish novel harking back to a time that has been unknown and misrepresented for decades.

The narrator of the novel – the reader still does not yet question at this point in the story whether the narrator is the Venetian or not – admits that with a touch of imagination, he rewrote what Hodja had written because Hodja destroyed his writings:

> At the end of this bout of writing, which lasted a month, one night, ashamed, he tore to shreds everything he'd written. It's because of that, as I try to reconstruct

> his scribblings and my own experiences, relying only on my imagination, I'm not frightened anymore of being overwhelmed by details that fascinate me so much. (*White* 65)

His reconstructions, which can also be described as distortions during the rewriting process are often not recognized because there is usually no access to the original version for various reasons including the language barrier, or the loss of the original. Thus, the later version becomes the reality of the earlier version as created by the translator. Considering that Pamuk's novel is a story within the story, the reader is further removed from an imagined truth and is warned against the untrustworthiness and subjectivity of different historiographies that are presented as truth. This critique of historiographies, similar to those offered by Republican narratives, implies that those narratives do not provide an objective or accurate narration of the Ottoman past but they, in fact, distort political and cultural realities according to their needs. Ironically, this reflects what the narrator Darvinoğlu's actions while dissecting the manuscript in the archive, a scene that further complicates Pamuk's stylistic and authorial approach.

With the Preface, Pamuk underlines the specific context that he wishes his reader to recognize, namely the Ottoman legacy that was still visible in the Republic. As Göknar points out, "This scene serves as a preface not only to one novel, nor to Pamuk's work as a whole, but in many respects to the tradition of the Republican novel and to the dilemmas of its cultural production" (*Orhan Pamuk* 91). As the place where an accumulation of historical records is preserved, an archive is heavily symbolic within the Turkish context when one remembers how the early Republicans understood the Ottoman

past. In this novel, Pamuk starts to challenge the Republican nationalist novel and places the Ottoman past before the eyes of the Republican intelligentsia through the narrator, Darvinoğlu. Thus, Pamuk criticizes the Republican metanarrative that promoted Turkish nationalism during the twentieth-century and denigrated the Ottoman past as being an obstacle to modernity by "reconnecting to an Ottoman cosmopolitan past" (93). To be able to connect with the Ottoman past, Pamuk needs to deconstruct the binary between the East and the West with the terms 'traditional' and 'modern' attached to them that the Republican narrative promoted, and which was presented as the main reason behind the alleged inferiority of the Ottoman Empire.

White responds to such a binary through the two main characters in the story, the Venetian and Hodja, by making them similar to each other to such a degree that later in the novel, they are allegorically lost in each other's identities. By the end of the story, the reader is not sure who is who, indicating the arbitrariness of the binary between the East and the West, the impurity of both sides of the binary pair as one contains the other, as well as self-orientalism that haunted the Republican intelligentsia throughout the twentieth-century.

The story of identity exchange in the novel presents an allegory for intellectual exchange and refers to the self-orientalism and imitation. The Venetian slave and the Ottoman master, Hodja, resemble each other to such a great extent that their identities become fluid at the end. Historically, Venetians ran the slave trade rather than being slaves, and Ottoman slaves tended to be Balkan or Anatolian. Therefore, Pamuk's choice of making the Venetian the slave of Hodja is another narrative strategy that the author

employs in his deliberate distortion of historical accounts. The first sight of Hodja petrifies the young Venetian, who says, “The resemblance between myself and the man who entered the room was incredible!" It was *me* there . . . for that first instant this was what I thought” (*White* 22). This incredible resemblance sets the tone for the rest of the story, in which the two characters display continuing example of doubling. The resemblance, backed up by a successful impersonation, makes it difficult to differentiate between the two characters:

> ‘Come, let us look in the mirror together.’ I looked, and under the raw lights of the lamp saw once more how much we resembled one another. …The two of us were one person! …I made a movement to save myself, as if to verify that I was myself. I quickly ran my hands through my hair. But he imitated my gesture and did it perfectly, without disturbing the symmetry of the mirror image at all. He also imitated my look, the attitude of my head, he mimicked my terror I could not endure to see in the mirror but from which, transfixed by fear… (83)

The mirror functions as a practical metaphor for Pamuk in this scene. The Venetian is terrified when he sees the extreme resemblance between himself and the Hodja. When the Hodja imitates his movements, no difference remains between the two. He is, in fact, looking at himself when he looks at the Hodja. Pamuk presents so many twists to the readers that, by the end of the story, the identity of the narrator is called into question.

When the war between the Turks and the Poles breaks out, the Sultan asks Hodja to use the “war engine,” an ultimate weapon that he spent years constructing, in the assault on a fortress called the “White Castle” in the Carpathian Mountains. Pamuk uses

his spin on regional history strategically, emphasizing the heterogeneity of the region, and the lack of divisions among all of the groups. Knowing that the weapon will fail, Hodja leaves Istanbul and goes to Venice to live the life of the Venetian. Consequently, his slave takes over Hodja's life. The end of the novel blurs this exchange of identities and the actuality of the story itself. Pamuk prompts the reader to consider the similarities between the two supposedly different worlds by making another character speak about them. The Sultan remarks to Hodja: "Was it not the best proof that men everywhere were identical with one another that they could take each other's place?" (151). The reader is then prompted to ask questions, such as who is actually writing the book. Is the narrator the Venetian or Hodja, or are they the same person? Is the story *real*? What are the implications of such a similarity between the western and the Ottoman characters? Most importantly, what is Pamuk doing by mixing these two identities and not fully revealing the actual narrator of the story? Is Pamuk showing the reader the impossibility of knowing the truthfulness of the stories that have been written about the Ottomans by the westerners? Or is he, in fact, saying that it is not possible to define someone's *pure* identity? Finally, why is the issue of the Ottoman-Turkish and Western characters are brought up in this novel at the end of the twentieth-century? Such questions guide my reading of the novel.

Pamuk's notion of identity is intricate as depicted through the characters of Hodja and the Venetian. All the effort that the Republicans, the Kemalists, and the nationalist metanarratives exerted in order to imprint ideas in the minds of Turkish people in the early twentieth-century was in vain. As Pamuk states:

> Identities are combinations of cultures. …But then I never attempt to know what Turkish identity is. …All sorts of descriptions and clarification of a given identity, all sorts of attempts to define a group, a tribe, a nation and pinpoint its identity, I think, are vain and, most of the time, serve very conservative political needs. I write my novels addressing both the national reader and international reader, and to both I would say that our national identities are fabrics designed to suppress rather than free us or liberate us. So I am not going to suggest that this Turkish or that Turkish identity is better. When I am making political comments… [on] whether Turkishness and Europe are contradictory, I say no, I don't think so. Sometimes I think "this is Turkishness," and then I think "this is Europe," and I don't think there is much difference. (Mirze 178)

Considering the novel in the light of Pamuk's fluid thinking on identity expressed in the interview quoted above, one is left with the idea that it does not make a difference whether Hodja or the Venetian is the narrator at the end of the story. Furthermore, the representation of the region in which the novel is set corresponds to Pamuk's notion of identity; it is not important, and neither is it possible to try to define one's identity when such imagined identities are intertwined through culture. This approach leads the global reader to question standard assumptions about the Ottoman identity and its relation to modern Turkish identity if the two can be separated at all.

Pamuk's satire of Orientalism can be considered as an example of the heterogeneity of the Turkish novel that is often two-fold. On the one hand, he uses it as the basis for different parts of the story where he implies how fantasies are at play when

forming stories about the Other. The narrator tells the reader how while writing his book, stories he writes seem like reflections of his fantasies, not that of the truth, but he believes them. On the other hand, Pamuk creates Hodja, who is curious about the western way of life and who, at the end of the story, goes on to live a life that is not his own. The individual's imagination, in this case, shapes the story and the identities, as underlined by Hodja's question about himself: "Why I Am What I am" (*White* 58). However, Pamuk does not stop at making the easterner question his identity, but reveals that, as opposed to the general belief, even the westerner has no idea about how to define his own identity. When Hodja poses the same question to the Venetian and asks him to teach him how to know why he was who he was, the Venetian is not able to produce an answer that could satisfy Hodja. Hodja firmly believes that 'they' (people in Venice) must have a better way to describe why they are who they are, and is not convinced by the Venetian's ordinary stories of the past. Pamuk's depiction allusion to Orientalism in the form of satire also shows how such heterogeneity blends with the descriptions of the modernist and the polyphonic novel.

By placing Hodja's expectations from the Other so high, Pamuk hints at the fantasies that are formed about the West and shows a different form of self-orientalism that cannot be alleviated even with facts. The author presents the question of identity at such an intricate level that, when Hodja begins writing using the title "Why I am What I am" every morning, he writes "nothing but reasons why 'they' were so inferior and stupid" (64). Now compelled to "sit [with Hodja] at the two ends of the table and write facing one another; [their] minds were confronted by these dangerous subjects" (62). The

Venetian ends up asking the same question, and "though half ironically" titles his writings as Hodja does, with "Why I am What I am" at the top of the page. The Venetian writes about all his "faults" and "evil" in an attempt to convince Hodja to do the same in order to discover who he really is. Hodja hopes that he can become like his western counterpart if he knows all about him. The Venetian thinks about Hodja, "he wanted to be like me; I could sense this in him" (66). However, as the Venetian's assumption is not granted after reading the evil deeds that his western double had committed, "…seeing such baseness, [Hodja] no longer wanted to imitate [the Venetian] but he was content to remain himself till the very end" (67). The Venetian convinces himself that he can stay himself *purely*.

There is a cosmopolitan self-awareness that Hodja achieves and which the Venetian fails to register. As the end of the novel convinces the reader, it is not possible to remain 'pure' as nothing is pure in the first place. By disappointing his protagonist with the Venetian's "baseness," Pamuk points out the difficulty and the meaninglessness of trying to embody another Self that is incompatible with one's own. By projecting this onto an Ottoman character, Pamuk underlines the incongruity that the Republican modernism illustrated with its interpretation of westernization, namely an unexamined acceptance of the western lifestyle with a strong connotation of self-orientalism. The West is not the embodiment of perfection, and science, as Hodja initially believes; it has its own faults, and imperfections, just as the East does.

The writing process that Hodja undertakes with the Venetian's substantiation is another way how Pamuk shows other dimensions of Turkish self-orientalism, further

complicating the question of identity concerning the Self and the Other. The more he writes, the more Hodja learns about his own "evils" and loses "a little more of what self-confidence he still had" (69). In the end, he "could no longer believe in himself, so had begun to seek [the Venetian's] approval" (69) for almost everything. For a short time, the Venetian hopes to make Hodja surrender to his "superiority" and to free him, as a result of Hodja's destroyed self-esteem. Later in the story, however, Hodja announces his plans to replace the Venetian and to take over his identity. Having studied the Venetian's life for years, Hodja now knows all the details of his slave's old life in Venice; the only thing left is to exchange clothes in order to become the Other, taking his place in a very particular way while retaining a double consciousness.

White offers a profoundly entangled relationship between the Self and the Other as well as between the East and the West. The Ottoman master 'Hodja' who does not have a proper name, and the Venetian slave, who also does not have a proper name, have an "uncanny resemblance" (52). Their similarity dissolves the Self into the Other. Both Hodja and the Venetian study each other's characters and lives during the years they spend together and they acquire a deep knowledge about each other, which is used as a tool by Pamuk to blur the narrative voice, further calling the issue of identity into question. The stage is reached when it no longer makes a difference whether one is from the East or the West, considering that each has the necessary knowledge to imitate or even replace the other. Thus, Pamuk challenges the Orientalist accounts of the Ottoman world originating from both western and Republican views.

By creating such an "uncanny resemblance" between Hodja and the Venetian, who would be an ideal western figure in Republican thought, he continues to contest orientalist thoughts about the Ottoman Empire and demonstrates how the attempts of the modern Turkish nation state to disown the Ottoman past have been futile. The "uncanny" signifies the recognition of the familiar in the unfamiliar, not the transition of one into the other. Therefore, the uncanny retains the hybridity rather than choosing between the familiar and the unfamiliar. Thus it embodies both the Venetian and Hodja, namely both the East and the West. The novel offers a new way of reading the Ottoman past and its relation to the past while portraying an Ottoman story from the archives, which is rewritten, reinterpreted, and reimagined for the world to question their understanding of the Ottoman culture.

From the Ottoman Theme to World Literature: *My Name is Red*

Thirteen years and three novels after the first publication of *The White Castle*, Pamuk meets his Turkish readers with multiple narrators in *My Name is Red* in 1998. Translated into more than sixty languages, this novel contributed to the author's election for Nobel Prize for literature in 2006 and solidified his place in world literature while highlighting Turkey's global emergence. Various literary awards, international success and a great number of scholarly studies on the novel have confirmed the literary value of the novel to the world. Göknar argues, "the continuing importance of the novel to Pamuk's oeuvre and its place in world literature is attested by its selection in 2010 as part of the Everyman's Library Contemporary Classics series" (*Orhan Pamuk* 13).

Hundreds of scholarly articles, reviews, and analyses have been written on the novel. However, only a few thoroughly discussed its relation to its local pioneers and even fewer of them traced how this novel helped position the contemporary Turkish literature in world literature through the viewpoint of its Ottoman past. Building upon, the examination of *The White Castle* as well as Tanpınar's treatment of the Ottoman past, my goal is to explore this specific point of argument in my analysis of the novel in correlation with the other works that I examine in this study. This approach lends itself to a more comprehensive analysis of the use and influence of the Ottoman past and its constructive role as an international identity – formed out of arduous attempts to create a national identity – for twenty-first-century Turkish literature. Localizing the novel offers a different cosmopolitan Turkish variant, however, comes not only from Pamuk's being global but also his being characteristically local.

My Name is Red is a significant work in terms of helping modern Turkish literature gain a considerable presence in world literature. The novel accomplishes this mainly via its thorough analysis of the world of Ottoman miniature painting and being one of the first examples of the modern Turkish novel that diverges from the Republican nationalist meta-narrative. The Turkish presence in world literature has an intriguing story in its background. To acquire a transnational presence, Pamuk first had to transcend the "national" borders in literature within Turkey by presenting such a divergence.

Through his novels, Pamuk shows the possibility of a literature other than Republican nationalist approach in Turkey. This attempt brings the cosmopolitan Ottoman past into the scene in a way that has not been done before. Thus, the Ottoman

past becomes instrumental in that modern Turkish literature could claim a postnational, and "postsecularist" position first within Turkey, and then, within the world. Accordingly, the notion of 'post-nationality' has a two-fold meaning in the Turkish case: one which allows Turkish literature to produce works alternative to Turkish nationalist literature and that offers a diverse literature and the other that carries such literature to a transnational sphere, thus, allowing modern Turkish literature to claim a space in world literature.

Pamuk used Istanbul as the setting for his claim for the cosmopolitan past. No other setting could have worked for his goal in his fictional as well as nonfictional writings than Istanbul does. Istanbul, the capital of the cosmopolitan Ottoman Empire and the home of multiple ethnicities as well as cultures, offers an excellent platform to reach out to the world through its literary representation in both of Pamuk's novels. I argue that Ottoman transnationalism and Istanbul's cosmopolitanism become even more pronounced in *My Name is Red*. As the setting of the novels I examine, Istanbul constitutes a consequential element for Pamuk's writing through which he goes beyond the provinciality of Republican nationalism while, at the same time, remaining primarily local. The Ottoman society portrayed in this novel shows a clear contrast to Turkish nationalism, which, in the aftermath of the 1980 coup, began to lose its popularity as part of the Republican Turkey's modernization project

The Ottoman theme in *The White Castle* is thematically continued with *My Name*. The latter surpasses what the former has achieved in terms of resurrecting the Ottoman theme within the contemporary Turkish literature as well as in world literature through its

considerable success in translation. The Ottoman context the reader encounters in this novel has a lot in contrast with the Republican, and nationally restricted perspective about the Empire. Thus, it reinforces the argument that *The White Castle* started: The Ottoman past needs to be revived and reinterpreted to understand modern Turkey's national and international representation.

No other fictional text in Turkish literature had established and detailed the Ottoman world in such a sophisticated light before Pamuk's seventh novel. The Ottoman Empire of the sixteenth-century in *My Name* – the reign of Ottoman Sultan Murat III (1546 – 1595) in 1591 – has a lot to do with its European contemporaries when it comes to the art of painting. The Ottoman manuscript in *White* is the main object of the novel, around which the story is set. The object becomes the Sultan's secret book of miniature painting in *My Name*. Compared to *White*, the Ottoman theme is even more distinctive in this novel. However, just like in *White*, Pamuk's main motivation to delve into the Ottoman past and use it as the novel's setting is not purely historical. However, the choice of the historical period of Sultan Murat III, who took keen interest in the production of art, particularly the art of miniature painting, and supported artists during his reign, is historically accurate.

As I discuss in Chapter 3, Tanpınar's perspective on the Ottoman painting and the art of painting, in general, both intersects and diverges from Pamuk's. Tanpınar emphasizes how the old masters of Ottoman painting are able to blend with "modern" aesthetics (*Peace* 170 – 171) in his attempt to show continuation and compatibility

between the Ottoman and modern Turkey. Similarly, Pamuk provides the details that are endemic of the old Ottoman masters' use of painting in their art to show a sense of homage towards the old masters. However, Pamuk does not intend to convince the reader for an absolute admiration of the past. In fact, he lays out the intricacy, jealousy and sense of inadequacy among the masters while Tanpınar writes from a more vulnerable point in history where he witnessed and experienced the melancholy of losing the culture of the past.

Although the ambiguity of the narrator in *White* is reinvented in *My Name* through the multiplicity of narrators, the mystery is never absent in Pamuk's novels. The novel tells a story of a murder and revolves around the unfinished, illuminated book of miniature painting that Sultan Murat III commissioned. He plans to send it to the Venetian Doge in the Islamic millennium to show to the West the power and supremacy of the Ottomans in the stories depicted in painting. He wants the miniatures to be painted in the European style. The novel starts with the murder of Elegant Effendi, one of the master miniaturists commissioned by Enishte Effendi for the preparation of Sultan's secret book.

The iconoclastic tradition of Islam sees painting as a critical subject, which deems realistic painting, particularly portraiture painting, as blasphemous since Allah is heralded as the master creator. Miniature painting, "the act of seeking out Allah's memories and seeing the world as He sees the world" (*My Name* 30) is considered the only acceptable form of painting. The novel illustrates the intricate relationships between the Ottoman

Istanbul, Venice, Central Asia, and Persia through the art of miniature painting as well as insisting on the continuum that connects them all. The multiple narrators of the novel constitute one of the pioneering examples of postmodern literary features in the Turkish literature.

The art of miniature painting, the primary medium that Pamuk employs in this novel and historically a significant form of art during the Ottoman Empire, is not chosen incidentally. Western-style painting and other forms of art were used to promote a sense of national identity and modernity by the political figures of early Republican Turkey. In his speeches around the country on the eve of the proclamation of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk stressed the significance of art for a nation's existence: "Sanatsız kalan bir milletin hayat damarlarından biri kopmuştur[93]" [A nation without art means that one of its vital arteries is missing] (my trans.). Atatürk continued his speech stressing how art had regrettably been neglected during the Ottoman Empire. The art in Atatürk's terms mostly refers to western-style painting and sculpture. This sense of art does not value Eastern forms of art, such as miniature painting, which was widely practiced in the Ottoman Empire since Western style art correlates with the notion of modernity in Republican thought.

The fact that Islamic tradition prohibits the depiction of graven images in painting and deems it blasphemous gives the secularist understanding of modernity one more reason to interpret the Ottoman culture as backward and insular. Ironically, *My Name*

[93] Quoted in Atatürk's speech in one of the *Türk Ocakları* clubs in Adana, Turkey on March 16, 1923. November 10, 2014, atam.gov.tr/ataturkun-adanadaki-konusmalari-uzerine/.

seems to support such a notion – only as a narrative tool – by making the issue of the realistic depiction of images in painting the central problem of the story. However, a careful reader soon realizes how Pamuk is, in fact, depicting an incredibly sophisticated understanding of art by the Ottomans and how competently the Ottoman artists practiced it. At the end of the story, the reader is left with the general notion that the Republicans held the practice of art during the Ottoman Empire cannot be justified simply because they followed the Islamic perspective on the depiction of human portraits in painting. The level of sophistication that the Ottoman miniature painting had and the novel exquisitely narrates transcends the validity of such criticism.

The game of the novel may be connected to miniatures as being only two-dimensional, representing the world without the depth of field, which is one of the functions of the multiple narrators, but then, when they are combined or sequenced, a more complex image emerges – one which does not resolve the multiple into the singular, but instead retains the multiple. Additionally, critiquing orientalist and self-orientalist ideas of the Ottoman past and modern Turkey through the connections between European and Ottoman painting styles, the novel shows how the imitation of the West is the very reason why modern Turkish has struggled with the issue of national identity. A critical reading of Turkish modernity and how it postures itself against the Ottoman traditionalism furthers the understanding of the multiple layers of meaning Pamuk designs for his novel. Turkey's modernization project envisioned a unified nation in its

way to progress. For Republicans, the modern Turkish nation was the opposite of what the Ottoman past represented.

Turkish modernity repudiated the Ottoman past for being the opposite of modernity and identified with the western idea of modernity. However, this politically motivated Republican argument claiming that the Empire was always stagnant, as supposedly Islam requires it to be, is flawed in its misinterpretation of Islamic traditionalism and fails to explain or give credit to the Ottoman experience of modernity, particularly during the late nineteenth-century.

Being a notoriously controversial term, modernity is problematic in itself.[94] Modernism is, in fact, a nineteenth-century concept, centered on the concept of nation. By retroactively going back to the sixteenth-century, Pamuk discovers the local, the pre-modern, the global, and the post-modern. Subscribing to its western definition and situating modernism in the West disregards centuries-long interactions between Western and non-western cultures, which, in fact, significantly influence how modernity can be defined. Although most Turkish critics today align with the idea that modern Turkish culture cannot deny the Ottoman legacy in its attempt to define national identity, I aim to take this idea a step further by arguing that not only Turkish modernity cannot be

---

[94] Until recently, modernity was accepted as a universally applicable paradigm, which every culture had to go through in one way, or another. In *The Consequences of Modernity* (1990), Anthony Giddens situates the origin of modernity in the West and argues that the rest of the world follows the example of the West to become modern. Later, in his book *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Arjun Appadurai refutes the center-periphery argument on modernity that Giddens promoted and argues that modernity cannot be reduced to a movement going from the center (defined as the West) to the periphery (the non-West). It is, in fact, a consequence of interaction on multiple levels between the West and the non-West.

explained without the Ottoman past but also the Turkish literary presence in the world today primarily lends itself to the cultural legacy it receives from the Ottoman past.

A heterogeneous term in itself, modernism is in contradiction with Turkish understanding of the concept, which moved Turkey away from the multi-ethnic Ottoman culture to an ostensibly Turkish nation state. Pamuk's novel situates itself against the Republican understanding of modernism, which defines itself by positioning the nation against the Ottoman Empire that it equates with anti-modern and shows how the Ottoman society could be understood more accurately once one takes off the Republican lens that recognizes only the Western interpretation of modernism.

Bakhtin, like Pamuk, goes earlier to get to a local modernity, which is not compatible with nineteenth and twentieth-century European modernity. Although Bakhtin "was profoundly unresponsive to the major works of twentieth-century modernism," (Emerson 17) critics found Bakhtin useful in analyzing works of twentieth-century literature.[95] Bakhtin experienced totalitarian regimes and two world wars. He did not have any faith in the modernist claim to progress. Accordingly, a Bakhtinian understanding of the genre of the novel shows how Pamuk lays out that Republican understanding of Turkish modernity, which viewed the West, as the absolute model for Turkish modernity is highly problematic. From this assumption, Turkish modernism generated the idea of a national identity by leaving no room for the individual without the nation, which is in contrast with the modernist claim to progress. Holistically

[95] See Hirschkop and Shepherd (1989) and Bauer and McKinstry (1991) as two examples of Bakhtinian reading of twentieth-century texts.

homogenizing, the Turkish modernist project did not have any space for individual differences in any part of life. Multiplicity, cosmopolitanism and innovative literary experiments were not welcomed in order to bolster the notion of 'national unity' and 'collective identity.' Thus, in *My Name*, Pamuk suggests how Turkish modernist project was a relatively unsuccessful attempt and generated far-reaching repercussions because it was built on a systematic denial of the past, which made it insufficient for the modernist project to succeed.

As I further discuss in Chapter 3, the existential question introduced by modernity, what happens to the individual who experiences the loss of origin that gives meaning to his existence is one that both Tanpınar and Pamuk explore. The Republican ideology, which prioritized the collective Turkish nation as a unity, as opposed to individualism, is questioned the authors' explication which offers insights on the difficulty of claiming an individual identity in a nationalist society. However, both Pamuk and Tanpınar counter such denial of individuality in a homogenize society by offering the multiethnic and cosmopolitan Ottoman world as an example, which allowed individuals to maintain their diverse ethnic, religious, and cultural identities within the Empire.

Pamuk challenges the homogenizing perspective of Republican modernity through the issue of style and individual identity, which is deeply blended into the art of miniature painting as a central question that the story poses. "Does a miniaturist, ought a miniaturist, have his own personal style? A use of color, a voice all his own?" (*My Name*

17). According to the Ottoman miniature masters in the novel, any trace of individuality meant the biggest flaw. "Where there is true art and genuine virtuosity the artist can paint an incomparable masterpiece without leaving even a trace of his identity" (18). As the Murderer in the story contemplates on the issue of style, he realizes how deadly it is to own an individual style in his case: "What was venerated as style was nothing more than an imperfection or flaw that revealed the guilty hand" (18). Having an individual style is an allusion to the issue of the individual identity of people that is discouraged by the Republican ideology.

Nationalist Republicans defined the individual just as a part of the state to exist. Individualism in itself did not matter; the nation always came first. The individual's existence was just for the wellness of state. When Enishte Effendi discovers the individualistic features of Venetian paintings and sees that "the essence of 'portraiture'" is the use of techniques that allows distinguishing "one man from another," Pamuk emphasizes the significance of individual identity as opposed to Republican notion of collective identity. However, Pamuk's meaning is not that simple to formulate, as he is not only contesting the Republican interpretation of the Ottomans but also western Orientalist portrayal of the Ottomans, as well as the notion of inferiority and belatedness that a majority of the late twentieth-century Turkish intelligentsia internalized.[96]

---

[96] Various works from twentieth-century Turkish literature discussed was the idea of 'belatedness,' which basically promoted the idea that Turkish literature would never be able to rise to the level of Western literature and modernity due to its belatedness of internalizing and employing such notions. Examples of this notion include *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark* (2004), [Blind Mirror, Lost Orient] and "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel" by Nurdan Gürbilek. In *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark*, Gürbilek, talks about the notion that supposedly Turkish authors feel when they go on to the world stage:

Although the Ottoman miniaturists in the novel seem to devalue individual style to conform to their traditions, they do not conform to a homogenous style. Their complicated perception of individual style is countered by their refusal to imitate the Western-style painting.

When the Western modernism formula that the Republican Turkey adopted did not produce the much-desired 'modernity,' the feeling left behind was that of deficiency. This explains the idea of belatedness that is often attributed to Turkish modernism is viewed with some banality. It is not received in the same esteem as their western contemporaries are. In fact, it is seen as an outcome of the failed modernist project. The theories of western literary critics and social scientists amalgamate this sense of deficiency and belatedness. The Republicans employed the idea, which is promoted by scholars, such as David Harvey that there is a universal promise of modernity originated in the West. In his 1986 essay "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," Fredrick Jameson describes all "Third World" literatures as "conventional and naïve" (66). "The third-world novel will not offer the satisfactions of Proust or Joyce; what is more damaging than that, perhaps, is its tendency to remind us of outmoded stages of our own first-world cultural development and to cause us to conclude that 'they are still writing novels like Dreiser or Sherwood Anderson'" (Jameson 65). How ironic it

---

"...about the discomfort of appearing on the world scene (also the scene of world literature) in the role of a child, or a servant, and hence being belated; about the uneasiness of being always sketchy, unfinished, and forever a novice; about boredom, the agony of death, the feeling of guilt, and injustice; and above all, the desire of talking about these things mixed with the uncomfortable acknowledgement that it is kind of too late to do so (188).

is then that Pamuk's narrative style is often likened to James Joyce in many literary reviews. Moreover, Pamuk, an indefatigable reader of Joyce, does not hide how he takes pains to be as elaborative as he thinks Joyce is. In an interview in 2003 on *My Name*, Pamuk stated:

> When I was writing my book I was thinking that probably critics would write, "Pamuk did to Istanbul what James Joyce did to Dublin." As I was writing, imagining the book as a modern, ambitious book, of course, I had in mind James Joyce - what James Joyce did to Dublin. To sum it up what he did for me was this: he considered his city, as I consider Istanbul, to be on the margins of Europe, not at the centre. Of course if you lived in that corner of the world you would be obsessed with all the anxieties of nationalism - your country is important, your city is important. So if you have that feeling then what you have to do is pull out your city, make it look and read like Paris or London - Balzac's Paris or Dickens' London - so that it will find its place in world literature.[97]

In this quote, Joyce is also peripheral according to the hegemony of Western theory. He is Irish and not English, and the city of his focus is Dublin, and not London. Dublin is more like Istanbul in many ways, including being connected to Greece rather than Rome. A sense of being marginalized and confined to the periphery is a sentiment that shines through both the works of Joyce and Pamuk and, in that sense, becomes some commonality between these two eminent authors.

---

[97] "Sense of the City: Istanbul," a BBC interview with Orhan Pamuk. November 12, 2014, news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3131585.stm.

Pamuk's novels, as well as a number of other novels, originated in the non-Western world and recently included in world literature canons, present strong examples to refute Jameson's argument. Although Pamuk recognizes and identifies with the connotations of this belatedness, he thinks that it is not an exclusively Turkish or non-Western feeling and argues that literature needs to be able to discuss it openly to explain it in plenary. In response to Mishra's statement: "You once said that you started to think about Ottoman history and Persian and Arab literature as a resource for your writing during a trip to the United States in 1985," Pamuk talks about his first experience in the United States when he was a young, not-so-well-known writer in Turkey. Pamuk says "…And I didn't exist in the American media, no one knew me. I was a minor Turkish writer. Then you feel humbled and angry. You want to go back and be in your room with all the Sufi stuff and invent modern Turkish identity and culture. And there were also anxieties, feelings of humiliation, Naipaul-like."[98] The feeling that Pamuk describes here is a different expression of the belatedness mentioned earlier. Pamuk's dissemination of a statement like this, as recently as in 2013, confirms how he shared the notion that many other Turkish authors experienced. However, this sense still does not affirm the naïve pupil argument but is implemented in the Turkish mind and reinforced by the West. Additionally, the idea of belatedness suggests a connection to the question of world literature.

---

[98] Pamuk's Interview with Pankaj Mishra, "Orhan Pamuk on Taksim Square, the Effects of 'Breaking Bad,' and Why the Future of the Novel Is in the East." November 8, 2013, www.newrepublic.com/article/113948/orhan-pamuk-interview-taksim-square-erdogan-literature.

Some texts have to wait for a long time before they are included in world literature canons and for others, this process is quicker. Pamuk is not intimidated by expressing the notion of belatedness he felt. However, he does not do it from the position of a self-orientalist although there is an underpinning criticism of Turkish self-orientalism. On the contrary, with these words, Pamuk makes the Western world question their role in making the non-Western feel that way while listening to a Nobel winner non-Western, but a global author. In *My Name*, Enishte Effendi elaborates on the affirmation that the artist seeks from others and how it makes the artist and his art genuine:

> What attracts us to writing, illustrating and painting is bound up in this fear of retribution. It's not only for money and favor that we kneel before our work from morning to evening, …it's to escape the prattle of others, to escape the community, but in contrast to the passion to create, we also want those we've forsaken to see and appreciate the inspired pictures we've made …Yet genuine painting is hidden in the agony no one sees and no one creates. It's contained in the picture, which on first sight, they'll say is bad, incomplete, blasphemous or heretical. (168)

If one assumes that Enishte Effendi voices Pamuk's ideas in his interview quoted above, it is seen that Pamuk is also the living proof for overcoming that *imposed* feeling, or "fear of retribution," turning it into a positive and productive tool, creating "genuine" art, and proving critics like Jameson wrong. Additionally, the story above indicates how Pamuk alters Turkish self-orientalism by re-using the Ottoman past, not from a self-orientalized

perspective but from a creative study. In the speech that he gave during the Nobel Prize ceremony, Pamuk further elaborated on the issue:

> What literature needs most to tell and investigate today are humanity's basic fears: the fear of being left outside, and the fear of counting for nothing, and the feelings of worthlessness that come with such fears; the collective humiliations, vulnerabilities, slights, grievances, sensitivities, and imagined insults, and the nationalist boasts and inflations that are their next of kin … Whenever I am confronted by such sentiments, and by the irrational, overstated language in which they are usually expressed, I know they touch on a darkness inside me. We have often witnessed peoples, societies and nations outside the Western world–and I can identify with them easily–succumbing to fears that sometimes lead them to commit stupidities, all because of their fears of humiliation and their sensitivities. I also know that in the West–a world with which I can identify with the same ease–nations and peoples taking an excessive pride in their wealth, and in their having brought us the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and Modernism, have, from time to time, succumbed to a self-satisfaction that is almost as stupid.[99]

Considered in this light, *My Name* shows that Ottomans employed a sophisticated understanding of modernity. Thinking the term in its typical definition as a claim to development by replacing Western practices with local ones, the novel suggests, through its claim to modernity, that the pre-modern Ottoman society demonstrates the term's

[99] Orhan Pamuk and Maureen Freely, "My Father's Suitcase," (2007).

limitations in a non-Western context where anything contrary is considered sophistry. It is striking that Pamuk's detailed account of the miniature painting in the Ottoman Empire, which portrays the complexity of the artistic society at the time, the struggles of the individual artists, the traditional forms of miniature painting and its encounter with the styles of other workshops and the West illustrate a symbolic *modernism* in arts, which is even more 'modern' than the Republican as well as Western parochialism and nationalism.

The secret book of the Sultan that Enishte Effendi is trying to prepare depicts "Sultan's entire world, just as in the paintings of the Venetian masters" (25). However, Pamuk complicates the issue and does not present the Ottoman miniature masters as mere imitators of the western artists: "But unlike the Venetians, my work would not merely depict material objects, but naturally the inner riches, the joys and fears of the realm over which Our Sultan rules" (25). In fact, the Ottoman artists in the novel are portrayed having a deeper understanding of the art of painting than their Venetian colleagues do. However, Enishte Effendi admires the Venetian paintings for their *being* the story in themselves.[100] When Enishte Effendi encounters the Venetian portraits for the first time,

[100] Ottoman miniatures were prepared mostly for sultans. The miniature art portrays actual events realistically yet adheres to the traditional canons of Islamic art, with its abstract formal expression. It is a way to record the stories and events of the day through depicting them in paintings. Almost all the paintings are concerned with important events of the day, such as Turkish victories, the conquests, state affairs and festivals. These chronicles are called "*Şahname*," book of kings. The authors of *şahname*s are called "*Şahnameci*." "Ottoman miniature painting, which was periodically affected by different artistic influences, was essentially a form of what can be called "historical painting. The most characteristic examples of Ottoman miniature art were produced in the second half of the sixteenth-century as a result of the patronage of Sultans Selim II (1566-74) and Murat III (1574-95). The reigns of these sultans mark the classical period of Ottoman miniature art and the most productive era in historical painting. Throughout most of these years, the Turkish and Persian works of Seyyid Lokman, the court-appointed *Şahnameci*, were illustrated in

he is "dumbfounded" as the portrait is nothing like the Ottoman miniature paintings. "More than anything, the image was of an individual, somebody like myself. It was an infidel, of course, not one of us. As I stared at him, though, I felt I resembled him" (26). This encounter shows the reader the striking resemblance between the Ottoman master and the portrait of "an infidel." This encounter is surprising for the Ottoman master, who is taught to believe in an unbridgeable difference between a Western individual and himself. However, just as the "uncanny resemblance" between Hodja and the Venetian of *White*, Pamuk indicates the arbitrariness of the Orientalist binary.

Pamuk contemplates on the issue of style throughout the novel and brings two contradicting ideas about style represented by his characters. While the Western art of painting allows the artist to depict the artist's unique style, the Ottoman miniature painting values having no individual style and adhering to the general features of the Eastern painting. This, however, does not necessarily prove that painting with individual style is more valuable. In fact, as in the eastern miniature painting, when the artist is concealed the art becomes more visible. The identity of the artist does not matter because what is important is the art itself. Pamuk emphasizes that the Ottoman artists employed this approach in their paintings.

Although the Venetian painting allows individuals to depict their uniqueness in their works of art, the Ottoman miniature can produce meaning by not necessarily

---

rapid succession by selected painters, working in the imperial studio. The bulk of Turkish miniatures comprise works of documentary value deriving from the depiction of actual events. November 13, 2013, www.turkishculture.org/fine-art/visual-arts/miniatures/miniature-painting-562.htm.

emphasizing the artist's individual style: "It is indeed important that a painting, through its beauty, summons us toward life's abundance, toward compassion, toward respect for the colors of the realm which God created and toward reflection and faith. The identity of the miniaturist is not important" (58). While he makes the distinction between the Western and the Ottoman standards of painting, Pamuk is not necessarily holding one superior to the other. In fact, not promoting individual style in the traditional Ottoman miniature painting is an individual style in itself defined by the traditions of the Ottoman artistic society. Thus, it is not productive to try to compare these two distinctive ways of art production, as each of them will have its own justifications for the styles to which they subscribe and the novel emphasize this productive disparity.

By detailing the reasoning behind the Ottoman miniature art, Pamuk answers to the Republican interpretation claiming that the Ottomans neglected the production of art. Art that is not produced for art's sake is useless for the Ottomans. Trying to acquire a 'style' in painting just because it is done so in the West is nothing more than pretension for the sake of material gain. One of the miniaturists Butterfly says "As long as the number of worthless artists motivated by money and fame instead of the pleasure of seeing and a belief in their craft increases, … we will continue to witness much more vulgarity and greed akin to this preoccupation with 'style' and 'signature'" (62).

Pamuk often surpasses the limits between painting and writing. Not having a style has its own negative attributes, as it prevents the reader from identifying the Murderer, who is one of the three miniaturists: Butterfly, Olive, and Stork. The Murderer, whose

identity the reader cannot easily decipher till the end of the story takes advantage of not having an individual style: “I have no individual style, or flaws in artistry to betray my hidden persona. Indeed, I believe that style, or for that matter, anything that serves to distinguish one artist from another, is a flaw – not individual character as some arrogantly claim” (98). Paradoxically, the Ottoman miniaturists all share opposition to a sense of individuality in art, as understood in the West, making the Republicans the ones, who are elide the individuality of which they accuse the Ottomans.

Each of the nonhuman narrators has symbolic value in the story. In order to show how Occidentalism was used as a way to despise the Ottomans, Pamuk provides an Occidentalist reading of the western art of painting through the eyes of an Ottoman painting of a tree. The narrator of Chapter 10, a painting of a tree, which does not know “where [it] belong[s],” (47) manifests a sarcastic parody of how Republicans would interpret the Ottoman perspective of Western art.

> And finally, I shall make mention of Frank painters, so if there are degenerates among you who have pretensions to be like them, may you heed my warning and be deterred. Now, these Frank painters depict the faces of kings, priests, noblemen and even women in such a manner that after gazing upon the portrait, you’d be able to identify that person on the street. (51)

The realistic feature of ‘Frank painters’ is undermined, as it would be an imitation of life and not an individual style as they claim it to be.

In the Islamic tradition, the depiction of human portraits is considered blasphemous. Although the Ottoman miniaturists follow the Islamic approach to the portrayal of humans in miniature painting, the artists in the novel are also curious about Western style in painting. This curiosity leads them to amalgamate and blend their local mastery with western styles, which controverts the notion that the Islamic Ottoman society was not open to any change or progress. The Ottoman understanding and evaluation of art and sciences was, in fact, never as simple as the tree in the story represents it.[101] Trying to justify their argument on the backwardness of the Ottomans, a number of Republican intellectuals chose to ignore the sophistication of Ottoman art or define it as conservative to a degree that it does not accept any form of progress during

---

[101] Almost all the Ottoman sultans valued different forms of art and supported art production and development during their reigns. They not only supported other artists, but they themselves produced various arts. Their perspective on different forms of art reflected upon the society, mostly the artists in the society, in a positive way, which increased the production and development of art within the Ottoman society. Moreover, the positive treatment of art in the Ottoman Empire attracted artists and their schools from Central Asia, Balkans, North Africa and Mesopotamia to Istanbul. This made Istanbul a perfect place to produce art. Suleiman the Lawgiver (1494 – 1566) was probably the most art-loving Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. During his reign, the Ottoman Empire not only reached the apogee of its military and political power but also flourished in the arts. A talented poet himself, the Sultan encouraged different forms of art including poetry, miniature, calligraphy, sculpture, manuscript painting, ceramic art, and architecture. His reign is often described as the "Golden Age" of the Empire due to the holistic nature of the developments in the Empire. Sultan Murat III (1546 – 1595), whose ruling period is also the historical setting in *My Name is Red*, was fond of miniature art and supported the miniaturists during his time. He commissioned various miniature volumes including *Book of Festivities*, *Husrev, and Shirin*, *The Blindman's Horse*, *Book of Victories*, *Book of Skills* and *Book of Kings* that are also referenced in *My Name is Red*. Sultan Selim III (1761 – 1808) was interested in poetry and music. There are sixty-four compositions that are created by him. Some of these compositions are part of Turkish classical music today. He was also interested in Western music and was the first sultan who invited an opera troupe to perform in the Empire in 1791. Şeyh Galip (1757 – 1798), a highly prolific Ottoman poet and one of the first representatives of poetry written in a form similar to symbolism in Turkey, was a regular attendee in Sultan Selim III's court. The Sultan also had his own collection of poems (*divan)*. For further information and examples of the Ottoman art of painting, see Shaw (2011), Levey (1975), *Portraits from the Empire: The Ottoman World and the Ottomans from the 18th to 20th Century with Selected Works of Art from the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Collection,* Istanbul: Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation (2005), and Fetvacı (2013).

the formation period of the Republic. Pamuk seems to invite his readers to realize the appreciation that he feels toward the Ottoman culture, which is both internally and externally dialogic. Thus, by only referring to the blasphemy argument would show a tragic misrepresentation of Ottoman art.

Each narrator uncovers layers of meaning in the story and each layer completes another part of the novel's allegory. When it is the Satan's turn to be a narrator, Satan is given voice by "the honey-tongued master storyteller" (291) at the coffeehouse, Pamuk furthers his innovative narrative methods by making a religious persona speak directly to the reader. Satan claims that there is a misreading of the Islamic perspective on the depiction of the man in paintings. "It was Satan who first said 'I'! It was Satan who adopted a style. It was Satan who separated East from West" (287). If Satan is the personification of "style," and individuality and if Islam deems life-like representation of the world in paintings under the name of style as blasphemous, the Satan, speaking while citing the Koran, disproves the attributions made both to Islamic perspective of style and the style itself.

While attributing to how Muslims refer to him as the source of all the sin, and miniaturists "picturing …[him] as a misshapen, horned, long-tailed and gruesome creature with a face covered with protruding moles" (289) in their paintings, Satan claims that it is "figurative painting" and has nothing to do with reality. He talks about how he is accused of being "behind all this painting in the Frankish style" (289), which is, again, the source of the problem for those who are against picturing life as it is in paintings and

by doing so, committing blasphemy. Finding them "far from the truth," Satan does not accept the accusations regarding the practices that the European masters commit by daring to "situate their subjects in the center of the page, …and display these portraits like idols;" "this narcissism," according to Satan, equals to "bow[ing] down before man," an act he will forever be proud for not having done (290). Thus, Satan would never make the miniaturists commit since the very reason why he was thrown out of heaven was because he refused God's command on prostrating before man. Men, who create such paintings, glorify humans by picturing them as godlike; those painters are "worshipping themselves, placing themselves at the center of the world" and Satan despises such an act more than anything. By making Satan considerably logical, Pamuk leads the reader to sympathize with the figure, which is famous for being the source of evil in literature and religion.

Pamuk's Satan is as "proud" as but not as attractive as Milton's in *Paradise Lost*, but he voices a highly strong sense of individuality that no other character in the novel does. From the beginning of his chapter, Satan deconstructs the reader's preconceptions about his perceived identity and warns the reader: "you're prepared to believe the exact opposite of what I say. But you're smart enough to sense that the opposite of what I say is not always true" (287). He reminds the reader that "he is not the source of all the evil and sin in the world" (289). Satan further complains about how he is depicted in paintings, which does not correspond to his looks but shows how the miniaturists use "figurative painting." He asks, "can the miniaturist … please explain why they persist in picturing

me as a misshapen, horned, long-tailed and gruesome creature with a face covered with protruding moles?" (289). Indeed, by painting him as a monstrous creature, painters reveal their own interpretations and ways of thinking. "It's not the content," argues Satan, "but the form of thought that counts. It's not what a miniaturist paints, but his style" (291). Satan's argument, a religious issue on the portrayal in painting into aesthetics and style. Through Satan, Pamuk challenges the religious interpretation of painting and blasphemy.

The past is fundamental to one's identity. It cannot be succumbed to limited and ideals of nationalism but can offer a richness of culture. *My Name* invites readers to look closely at the richness of the past that is neglected, misinterpreted and unappreciated.

My Name shows that describing the Ottoman culture as conservative would not be accurate, but it also promotes cultural blending as the only way for art and culture to exist. Such heterogeneity is not a function of modernity but rather something specifically Turkish that happens to blend with international modernism and the genre of polyphonic novel. This notion presented in the novel further indicates a disproval of the Republican claims to a pure national Turkish identity. The impossibility of pureness when it comes to a cultural and national identity in the Turkish case is emphasized throughout the novel. When the Murderer tells Enishte Effendi that his "reliance on the methods of the Venetians as well as your [his] mingling of our [Ottomans'] own established traditions with that of the infidels will strip us from our purity and reduce us to being their slaves" (160), Enishte Effendi replies:

> Nothing is pure. In the realm of the book arts, whenever a masterpiece is made, whenever a splendid picture makes my eyes water out of joy and causes a chill to run down my spine, I can be certain of the following: Two styles heretofore never brought together have come together to create something new and wondrous. We owe Bihzad and the splendor of Persian painting to the meeting of an Arabic illustrating sensibility and Mongol-Chinese painting. Shah Tahmasp's best paintings marry Persian style with Turkmen subtleties. Today, if men cannot adequately praise the book-arts workshops of Akbar Khan in Hindustan, it's because he urged his miniaturists to adopt the styles of the Frankish masters. To God belongs to the East and West. May He protect us from the will of the pure and unadulterated. (160-161)

Through the passage above, Pamuk conveys the idea that is central to the book: national or cultural purity has never been possible, nor is it desirable. He seems to condemn even the possibility of such a thing, as it would prevent culture from becoming. Throughout the novel, Pamuk elaborates on how the Ottoman artists make use of the western and their own artistic methods. By articulating a disbelief in the purity of arts through a fictional character from the sixteenth-century Ottoman society, Pamuk also shows how the Republican claim to national purity with the idea of 'Turkism' is, in fact, meaningless and how the Ottoman society was more aware of this fact than the *modern* Republican thought is.

Mere imitation of the West is neither practiced nor encouraged by the Ottoman miniaturists in the novel. Enishte Effendi despises the idea of simply imitating the Venetian masters while, at the same time, acknowledging their skills: "…there's an undeniable allure to the paintings they make by those new methods" (170). Being "afraid we [the Ottoman masters] are of labeled as imitators of the Franks," Enishte Effendi believes that if they imitate the Venetian masters, their paintings will "disappear" and "vanish" in time no matter how good they are. I interpret this absolute belief in the vanishing of paintings as an expression of the inevitable end of pretentious art. When the art is not genuine and not originated in its own culture, it is destined to be forgotten. This also applies to texts that fail to present originality. If everybody painted like the Europeans, the art would be uniformed, and there would include no local or cultural detail that makes art genuine. Thus, adopting the Frankish style to acquire individual style and identity would, in fact, be the end of even the possibility of any attempt to an individual identity.

Pamuk's exquisite emphasis on the imitation and the idea of original art can be interpreted as his perspective on art and writing. It would be *like the Frankish* and never genuine and original in the sense that miniaturists would want it. Unexamined westernization of the Republican nationalist period, Pamuk implies, proves the irony of identifying itself with the West in order to have an individual identity.

Through different narrators, Pamuk allows representation of both side of the argument about painting in the Ottoman and the Western style which leads to the idea

that there is no simple justification of any of the arguments. Chapter 35 of *My Name* is narrated by the *being* of a horse. This chapter conveys Pamuk's idea about the role of the artist in the production of art, which is "perceived differently by everyone." The consciousness of the narrator in this chapter illustrates the depth Pamuk grants to his characters. … "Everyone knows that there's no horse exactly like me. I'm simply the rendering of a horse that exists in a miniaturist's imagination" (217). What is striking about this chapter is that the narrator horse reverses blasphemous attributes to life-like painting. It tells the reader "The new styles of the Frankish masters aren't blasphemous, quite the opposite, they're the most in keeping with our faith" (218). According to the narrator, the Ottoman painters are the ones who commit real blasphemy as they "depict the world that God perceives, not the world that they see" (218). However, after showing the reader both sides of the argument, Pamuk tries to show that supporters of each side of the argument are not simply opposites. Art can represent different perspectives and none of these perspectives has to be true.

Pamuk furthers the discussion by bringing in the idea of a synthesis between the two worldviews of painting. Master Osman, who was a historical figure during Sultan Murat III's reign and the greatest name in Ottoman historical painting and the artist who mostly shaped Turkish miniature art during the classical period, becomes one of Pamuk's narrators in the second half of the novel. Disgusted by Enishte Effendi for causing him "unmentionable agony by forcing …[him] to imitate the European masters" (233), Master

Osman introduces the idea of a synthesis between the two styles in his opposition while he reviews the incomplete book of the Sultan that Enishte Effendi was creating:

> The desire to depict a tree simply as such, as the Venetian masters did, was here combined with the Persian way of seeing the world from above, and the result was a miserable painting that was neither Venetian nor Persian. …Attempting to combine two separate styles, my miniaturists and the barren mind of that deceased clown [Enishte Effendi] had created a work devoid of any skill whatsoever. But it wasn't that the illustration was informed by two different worldviews so much as the lack of skill that incurred my wrath. (250)

Master Osman's emphasis on the lack of quality in the art overcomes the combination of two styles. Thus, Pamuk reminds the reader that the quality of art is more important than attaining a style. Later in the novel, having a style is described as the reason why there was a superficial division between East and West although in reality the two were inseparable. The idea of a synthesis and style is further complicated with the details of individual traces that each Ottoman master (Olive, Butterfly, and Stork) leave on their work. Each of them, in fact, has a style, but what they call it is different from "the Frankish innovation called 'style'" (287).

The novel's intertextual relation to the Koran illustrates one of Pamuk's narrative innovations. Yıldız Ecevit argues that Koranic verses used both in the epigraph as well as within the novel allow Pamuk to use a sacred text for aesthetic innovation in the Turkish literature (155). Although Ecevit's interpretation is apt, The Koran is not entirely stripped

from its sacredness in the novel. It is still a source that the miniaturists often refer to when they try to justify their claims. Later in the novel, many of the generally accepted *truths* are contested: there cannot be a division between East and West because they are co-dependent. For God, according to Olive, it is possible for both East and West to meet at a new space free from the limits of the binary; "To God belongs the East and the West," says Olive, who is challenged by Black's words: "But East is east and West is west" (*My Name* 400), quoting Kipling's famous "The Ballad of East and West" (1895). Thus, Pamuk not only disagrees with the Republican but also with Orientalists that value such a dichotomy.

The section further suggests that Islam might not be disapproving the depiction of human in paintings as those, who oppose it, might claim. Pamuk indicates that the miniaturists might, in fact, be presenting their own interpretation of Islamic perspective and calling it the word of the book. This argument thus operates at a deeper level: What is believed and said in the present world about the Ottoman art in general and miniature painting, in particular, does not account for the complexity of the Ottoman artistic world. One of the most inaccurate claims about it would be the one that the nationalists came up with, which argues that the Ottomans did not value art and artistic practices.

All these detailed descriptions and perspectives on artistic style, miniature painting, its relation to religion and the difference between the Ottoman world and European world come down to refusal and disapproval of established beliefs about them. While Pamuk is contesting the Republican depiction of the Ottomans, he is also

contesting orientalist accounts of the Empire and showing to the world that the Ottoman Empire, its culture, and its cultural heritage cannot be understood through Republican or Orientalist accounts. This idea constitutes one of the central claims that the novel presents to the world and makes it one of the most crucial statements about the Ottoman past in a fictional work from the twenty-first century.

Pamuk charges his novel with themes that aesthetically distinguishes the novel from its contemporaries. Secrecy and imagination govern the novel in multiple aspects. At the center of the novel are the secret book and the mystery about the murderer of Enishte Effendi. The only way to find the murderer is to identify him through 'his individual style.' However, the concealing feature of miniature painting does not give away the identity of the murderer. Only a tiny little detail – the way the artist drew the nostrils of his horse – might allow Master Osman to find him. Through the issues of secrecy and imagination of the artist, Pamuk touches upon the western imagination that *painted* orientalism, indicating a significantly scopophiliac phenomenon.

Pamuk offers his novel as if it were a painting for the Orientalist gaze just to disappoint as well as surprise such a gaze with its unorthodox take on an Oriental content. In its re-workings on such issues, Pamuk takes up strikingly creative imaginations of nineteenth-century European Orientalist painters, travel writers, and historians who made use of in their representations of the Ottoman Empire: the Ottoman harem. To be able to find the murderer of Enishte Effendi, the Sultan asks the three miniature masters, Olive Stork, and Butterfly, to draw a horse. Their painting of a horse would leave the traces of

their identities and it would become possible for the Sultan to catch the Murderer as, ironically, each of these painters have their unique way of depicting a horse. Master Osman is not able to determine which one of the three painters is the murderer. Realizing that one of the painters committed a deliberate and "a completely unfamiliar mark, a "concealed signature, evident …in the nostrils of this chestnut horse" (296) in his painting, Master Osman asks permission from the Sultan to go into the Treasury. Thus, "a request as brazen as asking to enter the harem" (297) is made to identify where the origin of the flaw that the painter shows comes from.

Granting them the permission that probably only a few souls have ever been granted, Sultan allows Master Osman and Black to enter the heart of the Sultan's "secret world, to the Private Quarters of the Enderun"[102] (297). On their way to the Treasury, where they would be locked behind the doors "sealed with the seventy-year-old signet of Sultan Selim the Grim" (298) during the three days they are given, Master Osman and Black pass *in front of* the harem. It is striking how plainly Pamuk describes the scene in which a stranger – although Ottoman – can get is "the walls of the Harem" (297), where they can see nothing of the inside. The only other place where scenes from a harem can be seen is in the paintings in the Treasury, where harem women are depicted as having "…fingers in their mouths, stood behind half-opened doors, at the inaccessible windows of castle towers and peered from behind curtains" (336). The novel does not provide full

[102] Enderun Academy was the name of a school located in the Topkapı Palace. It was established by Sultan Murat II. It educated the children of mostly Christian converts to make them Ottoman statesmen. The school was active till the beginning of the twentieth-century. For further information on the Enderun, see Inalcık (1973).

access to see the harem even in paintings produced in workshops from "Samarkand and Baghdad over the last two hundred years" (336). When harem women are seen in paintings, they are "behind half-open doors" and at "inaccessible windows of castle towers" or seen "behind curtains." These are the only two parts where harem is mentioned in a heavily Ottoman novel, which might be surprising for readers who are accustomed to the Orientalist depictions of harems and eastern women in European literature and paintings. The absence-presence of the description of the Ottoman harem in the novel is a notable statement that Pamuk makes about European descriptions that constitute a considerable literature in the West. What other description would better deride the Western illustrations of the harem in various forms of literature than indicating that the only thing an outsider could see were the walls of the harem?

My Name's success in world literary circles comes mainly from its appeal to represent a cosmopolitan world that world literature appreciates. Throughout the novel, Pamuk continues to emphasize that Ottoman painting was as cosmopolitan as the society itself because of the cultural contacts that the Empire had with a number of different cultures. While talking about the different styles each school of painting employed and the variety of paintings they saw in the Treasury, Black says to Master Osman:

> My dear master, …over a period of twenty years here in Istanbul, you've united various artists from the four corners of the world, men of all natures and temperaments, in such harmony that you've ended up creating and defining the Ottoman style. …Despite being a great master of Persian legends and styles,

> you've created a distinct world of illustration worthy of Ottoman glory and strength." (332 – 333)

Acknowledging that the Ottoman artists had their unique style, and they acquired it by synthesizing different styles, Pamuk positions the Ottoman art high up on a scale of cultural sophistication, which became possible through its cosmopolitan nature.

The impressive cosmopolitanism of the books in the Treasury is described in quite detail, presenting a pleasant materialist allegory. These are the books that shed light upon the richness that the Ottoman culture embodied within its cultural *treasury*:

> The ones from Arabia, the Kufic Korans, those that that His Excellency Sultan Selim the Grim, Denizen of Paradise, brought back from Tabriz, the books of pashas whose poetry was seized when they were condemned to death, the gift volumes brought by the Venetian ambassador…. or the Christian books from the time of Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror. (302)

The books and pictures that Master Osman and Black lay eyes on represent a way to show to the reader a remarkable documentation of encounters between the Ottoman sultans and the western world that resulted in such exchanges of art and cultural contact. Among the paintings which belong to painters from different places and times, Master Osman asks Black what would it mean that the two pictures, one "from nearly two hundred years ago," another which was made "seventy or eighty years earlier" and their being the same as the "two miniaturists had created the same picture without having seen each other's work" (303). Pamuk emphasizes that despite "the hundreds of years that

separated them" how old masters depicted the same object, be it a tree, a horse, a woman, "in exactly the same way despite never having seen each other's work" (303). Following his master for years, a disciple learns how to imitate his master's style and "believes it to be the perfect form" (304) and never forgets it. However:

> …never forgetting does not mean the master artist will always use this detail. The customs of the workshop wherein he extinguishes the light of his eyes, the habits and taste for color of the ornery master beside him or the whims of his sultan will, at times prevent him from painting that detail, and he'll draw a bird's wing, or the way a woman laughs, or the nostrils of a horse… not the way it's been ingrained in the depths of his soul, but according to the custom of the workshop where he presently finds himself, just like the others there. (304)

The conditions of a painter's time and place determine the features of his artistic practice no matter how much he is trained in his master's style. Thus, there is room for change and freedom to detour from tradition depending on local conditions of time and place where a painter produces his work of art. Pamuk refutes another Republican claim, which suggests that Ottoman culture was not open to any kind of change because of its Islamic nature. The claim to change also emphasizes how art as well as literature can be defined differently and can vary significantly in different times and places. *What is World Literature?* David Damrosch argues that "world literature itself is constituted very differently in different cultures" (26) and what is considered to be literature, can change significantly within time; additionally, "even a genuinely global perspective remains a

perspective *from somewhere*" (27). If Damrosch's statement about world literature proves valid, applying this idea to the novel, the art of painting, which constitutes Pamuk's literary object in this novel, is also notably variable and how it is interpreted changes in time.

The main plot of the novel revolves around the secret book that the Sultan wants to be completed and the search for the murderer of Enishte Effendi and that of Elegant Effendi. Throughout the search, the details about the three main miniaturists of Enishte Effendi's workshop are revealed. However, identifying the murderer from the paintings and their styles becomes a challenge for the reader as each of those styles are blended in the styles of numerous masters. Pamuk depicts how futile it is to try to identify a specific style as purely belonging to one single person, the workshop, or the culture as they are all entangled in one another. Thus, Pamuk alludes to the meaninglessness of trying to define a pure identity for the modern Turkish nation while its roots are irreversibly located in multiple identities and, at this point, the Murderer's identity, just like the origin of Turkish identity, is impossible to reveal. Even if there might be a slight possibility of revealing it, it cannot be done without the Ottoman past.

The art can exist and carries artistic and literary value for centuries just as the painting of the two dervishes, who died one hundred and ten years ago, not only because they "were rendered in the Venetian style!" (307), but also because its story is articulated with different "recounts" in different "fashions." Most of the time, their reception is disparate in different times and places based on local acknowledgments of what art, or

literature is. Damrosch argues: "Any global perspective on literature must acknowledge the tremendous variability in what has counted as literature from one place to another and from one era to another; in this sense, literature can best be defined pragmatically as whatever texts a given community of readers takes as literature" (*What is World Literature?* 14). In addition to the local conditions, the perspective of the artist and the audience makes a tremendous impact on how a work of art or literature is interpreted. The two dervishes in the painting give a precise account of this notion that Pamuk wants to convey:

> While the Frank infidel was making our picture, he gazed at us so sweetly and with such attention to detail …he was committing the error of looking at the world with his naked eye and rendering what he saw. Thus, he drew us as if we were blind although we could see just fine, …According to the Hodja, we're in Hell; according to some unbelievers we're nothing but decayed corpses and according to you, the intelligent society of miniaturists gathered here, we're a picture, and because we're a picture, we stand here as though we were alive and well. (309)

This passage provides a precise example of how different viewers interpret the same text, differently based on their individual perspective. This nuance renders a great distinction as one would notice from the way a Republican would interpret the Ottoman art of painting. Modern Turkish perspective did not appreciate the Ottoman forms of art as they found it restricted to the religious rules. The nationalist reformation of art promoted the

western style in painting as well as in other arts by disregarding the richness and variety of the Ottoman art.

Interestingly, Pamuk portrays how the Ottomans valued 'art for art's sake' more than some of the Venetian masters did as the Venetians cared more about depicting the "bad side" of the Ottomans "simply because" those illustrations would "bring in more money" (308). Black further attests the role of the market and not the art itself: "…in this age when value is placed not on painting but on the money one can get from it, not on the old masters but on imitators of the Franks" (333). Both Black and Master Osman confirm that real art is not only imitating the Western style but combining it with the artistic knowledge of their own; it is not the Venetian style that makes art, but how an artist blends it with its own culture, wisdom, and style. Pamuk does not completely reject what the West has to offer. However, he is trying to show that the Republican undertaking of western culture turns modern Turkish culture into a mere imitator of the West, as Master Osman would say: "enthusiastic imitation of European masters" (335).

My Name as a work of literature operates on two levels: It contests the twentieth-century Republican metanarrative, which overlooks the Ottoman past, and challenges Orientalist notions in the West about the disregarded Empire by offering a new epistemology of the self in relation to the nation. This simultaneously gives the novel a particular place in world literature. The Ottoman Empire is neither completely Eastern nor Western. Thus, it can speak to both worlds. Stork, one of the miniaturists of the

workshop, comments on how the incomplete book of the Sultan would impact the Empire's reputation in the world:

> When this masterpiece was completed, in keeping with Our Sultan's decree and the late Enishte Effendi's desire, the whole world would marvel over the Ottoman Sultan's power and wealth as well as the talent, elegance and ability of us, His master miniaturists. Not only would they fear us, our power and our relentlessness, they'd be bewildered, seeing how we laughed and cried, how we stole from the Frankish masters, and ultimately, they would acknowledge with terror what only the most intelligent sultans understood: that we were situated both within the world of our paintings and far away in the company of the old masters. (372)

The novel, in a way, is the incomplete book of the Sultan, which would make the world understand that the Ottoman Empire was both situated in the West and in the East, both "within the world of [Ottoman] paintings and far away in the company of the old master." Pamuk, writing in a supposedly western genre, the novel, is showing to the world that the Ottoman Empire, as well as Turks, was part of a larger world than it is shown on a map. They embodied East and West within itself. Thus, the modern Turkish nation, coming out of that culture, cannot understand itself or be understood without the cosmopolitan Ottoman past.

When the three master miniaturists meet with Black after Black gets out of the Treasury, each of the miniaturists expresses their own longing for the days of their

apprenticeship and remember their memories together before they start fighting. Olive expresses his fear that their Ottoman style would be forgotten, as the new trend is to follow the "European style." "From now on, the European style would be preeminent in Our Sultan's workshop; the styles and the books we'd devoted our entire lives would slowly be forgotten" (381). This scene becomes reminiscent of how the Ottoman culture the Republicans left the Ottoman past to be forgotten. When Black threatens the Murderer with the needle that Master Osman used to blind himself "in imitation of Bihzad," the Murderer says:

> If Master Osman truly goes blind or passes away, and we paint the way we feel like painting, embracing our faults and individuality under the influence of the Franks so we might possess a style, we might resemble ourselves, but we won't be ourselves. No, even if we were to agree to paint like the old masters, reasoning that only in this way we could be ourselves" (389).

Pamuk equally distances his definition of a true artist from both the western attention to individual style and Ottoman disregard of it. The implications of this approach reveal that for Pamuk, style cannot be attained by deliberately imitating anyone else's practices. An artist should discover his or her own style through his imagination and motivations.

One of the narrators through the very end of the book in Chapter 58 is the Murderer. He wraps up the bigger picture that the novel has been drawing for its reader from the beginning. This is also the chapter where we learn that the Murderer is Olive, whose name is "Velijan Effendi, the Persian." When the Murderer shows the other two

miniaturists and Black the final picture of the book, they feel as if they were "no longer looking at a page from a book but at the world seen through a window" (399). In the final picture of the book, the Murderer tells them that he drew his own portrait where the Sultan's portrait should have been. He says:

> I was somewhat unsatisfied with it because after laboring in vain for days, looking into a mirror and erasing and reworking, I was unable to achieve a good resemblance; still, I felt unbridled elation because the picture not only situated me at the center of a vast world but for some unaccountable and diabolic reason, it made me appear more profound, complicated and mysterious than I actually was" (399).

The Murderer, who painted his own portrait using the style of the Venetians, feels that he has an individual style and identity. However, it is still not truly how he really is. Reminiscent of Thomas Phillips' famous painting, *Lord Byron in Albanian Dress* (1835), the Murderer's comments on the portrait might remind the reader that the Sultan in the novel, who once had "a Venetian painter – his name was Sebastiano – make a portrait of His Excellency in the Frankish style as if He were an infidel king" (335). None of them looks like themselves in those portraits. The Murderer talks about how he feels: "Imitating the Frankish masters without having attained their expertise makes a miniaturist even more of a slave" (399). This is the scene where Pamuk despises most explicitly the slavish imitation of the West that the Republican modernity adapted. The Murderer continues to convey what seems to be Pamuk's ultimate message for the

Republicans as well as the Ottomans of the Tanzimat period, who thought the imitation of the West, would 'modernize' the Ottoman culture:

> So, listen carefully to the last of what I will tell you: … If we're reduced to imitating the Frankish masters, as the late Enishte and Our Sultan desired, we will be restrained, if not by the Erzurumis and those like Elegant Effendi, then by the justified cowardice within us, and we won't be able to continue. If we shall sway to the Devil and continue, betraying everything that has come before in a futile attempt to attain a style and European character, we will still fail – just as I failed in making this self-portrait despite all my proficiency and knowledge. This primitive picture I've made, without even achieving a fair resemblance of myself, revealed to me what we've known all along without admitting it: The proficiency of the Franks will take centuries to attain. Had Enishte Effendi's book been completed and sent to them, the Venetian masters would've smirked, and their ridicule would've reached the Venetian Doge – that is all. They'd have quipped that the Ottomans have given up being Ottoman …How wonderful it would be if we could persist on the path of the old masters. But no one wants this… In that case, sit yourselves down and do nothing but ape Europeans century after century! Proudly sign your names to your imitation paintings. The old masters of Herat tried to depict the world the way God saw it and to conceal their individuality they never signed their names. You, however, are condemned to signing your names to conceal your lack of individuality. (399 – 400)

Embodying Western style for the sake of modernity resembles what Ottoman miniaturists in the novel refuse. Reminiscent of *Arabian Nights* that the book is a deferral of death, that of the murderer, whose revelation it keeps at bay, the novel ends with Shekure who tells the reader that she told the story to her son Orhan and warns the reader that Orhan might not *depict* the story as it "actually was," and adds "…don't be taken by Orhan if he's drawn Black more absentminded than he is, made our lives harder than they are, Shevket worse and me prettier and harsher than I am. For the sake of a delightful and convincing story, there isn't a lie Orhan wouldn't deign to tell" (413). With these last words of the novel, Pamuk is able to surpass boundaries between painting and writing, East and West, past and present, time and space, reality and fiction, and between reader, the author, and the narrator. *My Name* positions Pamuk in world literature as a master of storytelling, who can perfectly blend the eastern and the western styles of narrative, and the book becomes, as Göknar puts it, Pamuk's "large canvas" where he draws a miniature in writing. Moreover, it repositions the Ottoman Empire in the world literary scene that is outside the cultural borders of modern Turkey. Thus, it shows the global reader the cosmopolitan heritage that modern Turkey seems to be reclaiming and letting the world see while writing his novel in his own style.

My Name is Red, above all, is about perspective, style and secrets, which makes some things clear while making others obscure, just as a style that both shows and conceals. As IMPAC comment on the novel claims, the novel opens a window to the Ottomans and to their world of miniature painting for the world to see, primarily

appealing to the global reader of the twenty-first century. For the Turkish reader, however, it challenges Turkish modernism in an unorthodox manner that indicates heterodox possibilities that modern Turkish literature might embody. Where these two readerships meet, on the other hand, is the space world literature provides.

Conclusion

This project has aimed to show that the current and increasing presence of contemporary Turkish literature in world literature is significant for two main reasons: the local to global literary representation through "literary neo-Ottomanism, a term that defines the re-evaluation of the Ottoman past, and Turkey's contribution to the discussions on world literature in the West. I analyze the works of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk and argue that its literary presence, reinforced by these two authors among others, allows Turkey to explore multiple ways of re-defining its local but cosmopolitan voice in a global setting by resurrecting its Ottoman past through the genre of the novel. Additionally, by interpreting the ways these novels function in the global literary space, the novels contribute to the debates on world literature by offering a historically inflected reading of this increasingly dynamic discipline.

The new mode I demonstrate challenges the perspective that sees theorization of world literature as a product originated in the West to be used by the rest of the world. Instead, Turkey adopts and practices its own definition of what world literature might entail by taking an active role in the global representation of the Ottoman past as an integral part of modern Turkey and participates in this global conversation as a diligent member. A similar perspective can be traced in the novels I study, as they question the

idea of modernism originated in the West and taken up by non-Western nations by indicating different understandings of this twentieth-century phenomenon.

In this project, I show that the novels by Tanpınar and Pamuk are significant examples of the Ottoman theme that is now translated into world literary space. I further the idea of "literary neo-Ottomanism" within the context of these novels and project the concept onto the wider ramifications of Turkey in the world literary space redefining both local and global conceptions on Ottoman Turkish cultural identity. This is not in contradiction with, but in continuation of the contemporary Turkey and Turkish literature as a cosmopolitan culture, consisting of multiple cultural and ethnic voices that exist in it. Through their investment and claim for an inseparable cultural connection between the Ottoman past and present Turkey, the works I analyze account for alternative ways of reading the Turkish historical past and culture in relation to its present and the world.

Recently taken up by Turkish literary critics as well as global scholars, their investigation opens up ways to explore literary neo-Ottomanism as well as modernism at a moment when debates on cosmopolitanism and world literature have been experiencing a considerable reassessment since the 2000s. These works' projections on Turkey within the context of the Ottoman past, and now in the world at large, offer a new narrative of reading a national literature while also giving it a cosmopolitan status that has been disclaimed for a century.

Studying Turkish novels in a global context has enabled me to discover alternative ways of thinking about national literatures. Trying to avoid the scholarly but

vicious circle of examining representative works and authors from Turkey, I have been challenged by the scarcity of translated Turkish works and comparative scholarly work on Turkey throughout my tenure in the U.S. academia. Such a challenge allowed me to gain a unique perspective to read the Turkish works that have been intensely studied in global literary networks, such as those of Orhan Pamuk, with the lenses of a scholar with the knowledge of local and global perspectives on Turkish literary presence in the world today.

The physical distance I had with Turkey while living in the U.S. and the exposure to the abundance of Western accounts on Ottoman Empire and Turkey creating a disquieting contrast with the scarcity of critical studies from Turkey have transformed into an academically productive and crucial perspective that I have employed throughout my research and writing on Turkey. The established legacies of stereotypes of Ottomans and Turks, as seen in a wide range of scholarly accounts as well as the predominance of the negative perspective of Turkish Republican metanarrative on the Ottoman that impacted generations of intellectuals in Turkey, are being challenged by alternative ways of interpreting the Ottoman past and voicing multiple narratives that come out of Turkey. Turkish authors are stepping in the world literary scene more confidently to write about themselves rather than reading what others have written about them.

I have become acutely aware of the need for comparative and transnational academic studies on Turkey and its rising presence in world literature to show the current practices of Turkish authors that challenge prevailing misconceptions and stereotypes of

not only the Ottoman and the Turkish but also their complex relationship with each other both in Turkey and in the West. This perspective has deepened my conviction that, as scholars, we need to obtain more cosmopolitan and critical ways of investigation to be able to evaluate Turkish literature within the context of world literature, which, as opposed to many other individual national literatures, resists being classified into any single category of academic studies, such as postcolonial, national, secular, etc. Such a comparative and transnational approach to the study of Turkey reveals important connections and interpretations of the concepts and terms like 'national identity' 'cosmopolitanism,' and 'world literature' which the works I study invest in.

Studying Turkish literature, along with my research in world literature, and Western literary theory, as a critic who is primarily trained in the U.S., I have become deeply perceptive about not subscribing to any single point of view, either local or global, but go beyond them so that I could successfully explore alternative ways of working within and across the allegedly different worlds: East and West. This has allowed me to conclude a scholarly study aiming to serve for the cultivation of the need, I state above, in our cosmopolitan moment.

In the novels, my focus has been on their conversation with the world through the Ottoman theme that they mourn (*A Mind at Peace*), scrutinize (*My Name is Red*), or satirize the notions of modernism – portrayed as the binary of the Ottoman 'traditionalism' – (*The Time Regulation Institute*), and question local and global historiographies of the Ottoman world (*The White Castle*). By reading these novels as

works of world literature, I have concentrated on the question of what 'world literature' might, indeed, entail and how national literatures self-represent and what the "self" in this context might, in fact, mean. I have aimed to think beyond all the elusive definitions the term has been attributed so far in Western academia, such as circulation of works into a global space (Damrosch), a second identity or global significance a work gains in its translated "afterlife" (Benjamin), and de-centering of the nations while their literature cross national borders among others, with many theoretical and methodological implications.

My primary motivation for employing a critical approach to the discipline of world literature was to distinguish my approach from the global mainstream practice in critical literary analysis, which *uses* theory that is created in Western academia while the rest of the world *takes* and *applies* it on their scholarship.

Referring to the increasing range of authors and countries that have begun to take space in world literature, particularly during the last two decades, Damrosch acknowledges the next phase in the discourse of world literature. "At once exhilarating and unsettling, the range and variety of literatures now in view raise serious questions of scale, of translation and comprehension, and of persisting imbalances of economic and cultural power" (*World Literature in Theory* 1). Placing Turkey in this "exhilarating and unsettling" variety, I have realized that analysis of Turkish literature, as part of world literature, did not have to be defined solely by the theoretical frame drawn in the Western academia. The main Turkish representation in world literature today comes from the

works of Tanpınar and Pamuk. Although Pamuk has been conscious of international literary relations, and aware of the politics of world literature that allowed him to appropriate his priorities and literary moves, what made his *national* subject *international* was not solely the "increasingly complex patterns of travel, emigration, and publication," (1) but Pamuk's choice in underlining the cosmopolitan nature of the Ottoman Empire and presenting the world an already international, and culturally hybrid content from a local context. Additionally, Tanpınar's recent translations are a reflection of the re-discovery of the transnational potential in his works by mainly Turkish readers and not by the author's conscious choice.

As an emerging literary scholar, I am intervening in the global conversation on world literature through this project, which consists of the invigorated and cosmopolitan Ottoman-Turkish theme while projecting it on the global context of world literature. My intervention suggests that in the case of Turkey, a new mode of reading and being a part of world literature occurs through the Ottoman past, inviting literary and cultural scholars from around the world to think about and collectively contribute to the discipline's dynamic nature. Such reassessment of the Ottoman past not only helps Turkey question its own interpretation but it also leads the global reader to interpret the Ottoman Empire as the cosmopolitan ancestor of modern Turkish culture.

Bibliography

Afridi, Mehnaz M. and David M. Buyze, Eds. *Literatures and the Cultures of the Islamic World: Global Perspectives on Orhan Pamuk*: *Existentialism and Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Ahmad, Feroz. *The Young Turks; the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics 1908 – 1914*. Clarendon Press, 1969.

Ali, Barish and Caroline Hagood. "Heteroglossic Sprees and Murderous Viewpoints in Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red*" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 54:4 (2012): 505-529.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Verso, 1991.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature*: *On the Politics of Untranslatability*. Verso, 2013.

---. *Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature.* Princeton UP, 2006.

---. "Global *Translatio*: The "Invention" of Comparative Literature, Istanbul, 1933. *Critical Inquiry* 29:2 (2003): 253-281.

Aydın, Mehmet. *Kayıp Zamanın İçinde: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2010.

Bakhtin, Michail M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics*. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

---. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press, c1981.

Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*. Trans and Ed. Jonathan Mayne. Phaidon, 1970.

Bauer, Dale M. and Susan Jaret McKinstry, Eds., *Feminism, Bakhtin, and the Dialogic.* State University of New York Press, 1991.

Beebee, Thomas O. *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of generic Instability*. Pennsylvania State UP, c1994.

Belge, Murat. *Genesis: "Büyük Ulusal Anlatı" ve Türklerin Kökeni*. İletişim, 2008.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Schocken Books, 1969.

---. "The Task of the Translator" in *Selected Writings Volume 1, 1913-1926*. 5th Ed. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Harvard UP, 2002.

Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will*. Ed. Benjamin Nelson. Harper Torchbooks, 1960.

---. *Mind Energy: Lectures and Essays*. Trans. H. Wildon Carr. Henry Holt & Co., 1920.

---. *The Creative Mind*. Trans. Mabelle L. Andison. Greenwood Press, 1946.

Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. McGill UP, 1964.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. SAGE Publications, 1995.

Bonnie Kime Scott. *Refiguring Modernism*. Indiana UP, 1995.

Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. Basic Books, 2001. Digital file.

Bozdoğan, Sibel and Esra Akcan. *Turkey: Modern Architectures in History*. Reaktion Books, 2013. Digital file.

Brookes, John Benjamin. *The Lustful Turk, or Lascivious Scenes from a Harem*. Amazon Digital Services LLC, 1828; 2014.

Brown, L. Carl. Ed. *The Imperial Legacy: The Ottoman Imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East*. Columbia UP, 1996.

Brummett, Palmira. *Mapping the Ottomans: Sovereignty, Territory, and Identity in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Cambridge UP, 2015. Digital file.

Bryce, Derek. "The Absence of Ottoman, Islamic Europe in Edward W. Said's *Orientalism.*" *Theory, Culture & Society* 30 (2013): 99-121.

Cady, Linell E. and Elizabeth Shakman Hurd. Eds. *Comparative Secularism in a Global Age*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. Open UP, 1997.

Camus, Albert. *Lyrical and Critical Essays*. Knopf, 1968.

Carr, E.H. *Nationalism and After*. Macmillan, 1945.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M. B. DeBevoise. Harvard UP, 2004.

Cheah, Pheng and Bruce Robbins. Ed. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. University of Minnesota Press, c1998.

Cohen, Margaret. *The Sentimental Education of the Novel*. Princeton UP, c1999.

Çağın, Şerife. "Orhan Pamuk ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ı Birlikte Okumak." *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Dergisi* 4 (2011): 63-81.

Çırakman, Aslı. *From the "Terror of the World" to the "Sick Man of Europe": European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth.* P. Lang, 2002.

Dale M. Bauer and Susan Jaret McKinstry, Eds. *Feminism, Bakhtin, and the Dialogic.* State University of New York Press, 1991.

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?*. Princeton UP, 2003.

---. *Teaching World Literature.* Modern Language Association of America, 2009.

---. *World Literature in Theory*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.

D'haen, Theo. *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature.* Routledge, 2012. Digital file.

---. Ed. *The Routledge Companion to World Literature.* Taylor and Francis, 2011. Digital file.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Bergsonism*. Zone Books, 1988.

de Man, Paul. "The Resistance to Theory." *Yale French Studies* 63 (1982): 3-20

Drucker, Johanna. *Graphesis – Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*. Harvard UP, 2014.

DuBois, Andrew and Frank Lentricchia. Eds. *Close Reading: The Reader*. Duke UP, 2002. Digital file.

Eagleton, Terry. "Awakening from Modernity" *Times Literary Supplement* 20 (1987): 194.

Ecevit, Yıldız. *Türk Romanında Postmodernist Açılımları.* İletişim Yayınları, 2014.

---. *Orhan Pamuk'u Okumak: Kafası Karışmış Okur ve Modern Roman*. İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

Efendi, Emin Nihat. *Müsameretname*. Özgür Yayınları, 2010.

Emerson, Caryl. "Introduction: Dialogue on Every Corner, Bakhtin in Every Class," in *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines*. Ed. Amy Mandelker. Northwestern UP, 1995.

Engigün, İnci and Zeynep Kerman. Ed. *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*. 3rd Ed. Dergâh Yayınları, 2008.

Engigün, İnci. *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, (1839-1923)*. Dergâh.

Ertürk, Nergis. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. Oxford UP, 2011.

---. "Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey." *Boundary 2* 37:2 (2010): 155-185.

---. "Those Outside the Scene: Snow in the World Republic of Letters." *New Literary History* 41:3 (2010): 633-651.

---. "Modernity and Its Fallen Languages: Tanpınar's *Hasret*, Benjamin's Melancholy." *PMLA* 123:1 (2008): 41-56.

Evin, Ahmet. Ö. *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Biblioteca Islamica, 1983.

Fetvacı, Emine. *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*. Indiana UP, 2013.

Findley, Carter V. *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity: A History 1789-2007*. Yale UP, 2010.

Finn, Robert P. *The Early Turkish Novel, 1872-1900*. Isis Press, 1984.

Foucault, Michel. "Questions of Method: An Interview with Michael Foucault" *Ideology and Consciousness* 8 (1981): 3-14.

Freely, John. *A History of Ottoman Architecture*. WIT Press, 2011.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton UP, 2000. Digital file.

Gallop, Jane. "The Historicization of Literary Studies and the Fate of Close Reading."

Profession (2007): 181-186.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nationalism*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1997.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1990.

Giorgi, Kyra. *Emotions, Language and Identity on the Margins of Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgagn von and Johann Peter Eckermann. *Converstaions with Goethe*. Dutton, 1971.

Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Göbenli, Mediha. *Direnmenin Estetiğine Güven*. Donkişot Yayınları, 2005.

Gökçek, Fatma Müge. *Transformation of Turkey: Redefining State and Society from the Ottoman Empire to the Modern Era*. I.B. Tauris, 2011. Digital file.

Göknar, Erdağ. *Orhan Pamuk, Secularism, and Blasphemy*. Routledge, 2013.

---. "The Novel in Turkish: Narrative Tradition to Nobel Prize" in *The Cambridge History of Turkey.* Vol. 4. Cambridge UP, 2008.

---. "Orhan Pamuk and the "Ottoman" Theme." *World Literature Today* 80.6 (2006): 34-38.

---. "My Name Is Re(a)d: Authoring Translation, Translating Authority." *Translation Review* 68 (2004): 52-60.

Gün, Güneli . "The Turks Are Coming: Deciphering Orhan Pamuk's Black Book." *World Literature Today* 66:1 (1992): 59-63.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. *The New Cultural Climate in Turkey: Living in a Shop Window*. Trans. Victoria Holbrook. Zed Books, 2011.

---. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel" *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102:2/3 (2003) 599-628.

Hall, John. *The Sociology of Literature*. London and Longman, 1979.

Halman, Talat. *The Turkish Muse: Views and Reviews, 1960s – 1990s*. Ed. Jayne L. Warner. Syracuse UP, 2006.

---. *Rapture and Revolution: Essays on Turkish Literature*. Syracuse UP, 2007.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. "The Historical Roots of Kemalism" in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*. Eds. Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred Stepan. Columbia UP, 2012. Digital file.

---. *Atatürk: An Intellectual Biography* by Princeton UP, c2011.

---. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton UP, 2008.

---. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford UP, 1995.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Blackwell Publishers, 1990.

Hayes, Carleton and Joseph Huntley. *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*. Macmillan, (1931), 1959.

Heiserman, Arthur Ray. *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*. University of Chicago Press, c1977.

Hirschkop, Ken and David Shepherd, Eds. *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory.* Manchester UP, 1989.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger. Ed. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge UP, 1992.

Hroch, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Columbia UP, 1985.

İnalcık, Halil. *Osmanlılar: Fütühat, İmparatorluk, Avrupa ile İlişkiler*. Timaş, 2010.

---. *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*. Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Series Vol. 9, 1993.

---. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*, Trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973.

İnci, Handan. Ed. *Tanpınar Zamanı.* [Tanpınar Time]. Kapı Yayınları, 2012.

---. "Tanpınar Kime Mektup Yazdı?" *Kitap-lık* 147 (2011) 84 - 87.

Ingram, Anders. *Writing the Ottomans: Turkish History in Early Modern England*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Jameson, Fredrick. "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism." *Social Text* 15 (1986): 65-88.

Jezernik, Božidar. Ed. *Imagining 'the Turk.'* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

Jusdanis, Gregory. *The Necessary Nation.* Princeton UP, 2001.

---. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature.* University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Kadir, Djelal. "To World, to Globalize – Comparative Literature's Crossroads." *Comparative Literature Studies*. 41.1 (2004): 1-9.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. University of California Press, 1995.

Kaplan, Mehmet. *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası*. (1963). Dergâh Yayınları, 2013.

Karpat, Kemal H. *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*. Brill, 2002.

Kastoryano, Riva. *Turkey between Nationalism and Globalization*. Taylor & Francis, 2013.

Kedourie, Elie. Ed. *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. World Pub. Co., 1970.

Kerman, Zeynep. Ed. "Romana ve Romancıya Dair Notlar I" in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Dergah Yayınları, 1992.

Kipling, Rudyard. *The Ballad of East and West*. New York: M.F. Mansfield and A. Wessels, 1899. Harry Ransom Center Book Collection.

Kohn, Hans. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background*. The Macmillan Company, 1944.

Konuk, Kader. "Istanbul on Fire: End-of-Empire Melancholy in Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul" *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, 86:4 (2011): 249-261.

---. *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey.* Stanford UP, 2010.

---. "Erich Auerbach and the Humanist reform to the Turkish Education System." *Comparative Literature Studies* 45:1 (2008): 74-89.

Köroğlu, Erol. *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey During World War I*. I.B. Tauris, 2007. Digital file.

Kugler, Emily M. N. *The Sway of the Ottoman Empire on English Identity in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Brill, 2012.

Kuran-Burçoğlu, Nedret. *Die Wandlung des Türkenbildes in Europa: Vom 11. Jahrhundert bis zur heutigen Zeit*. Eine Kritische Perspektive, 2005.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Harvard UP, 1993.

Levey, Michael. *The World of Ottoman Art.* Thames and Hudson, 1975.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. Oxford UP, 1968.

Lewis, Geoffrey. *Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford UP, 1999.

Lotman, Yuri M. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Love, Heather. "Close but not Deep: Literary Ethics and the Descriptive Turn." *New Literary History* 41:2 (2010): 371-391.

Lukács, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel*. Trans. Anna Bostock. The MIT Press, 1974.

---. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah Mitchell. University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Maclean, Gerald. *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Mardin, Şerif. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas.* Syracuse UP, 2000.

---. *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler 4*. İletişim Yayıncılık, 1991.

---. "European Culture and the Development of Modern Turkey" in *Turkey and the European Community*, Ed. Ahmet Evin and Geoffrey Denton. Leske U. Budrich, 1990.

McKeon, Michael. Ed. *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach*. The John Hopkins UP, 2000.

Melas, Natalie. *All the Difference in the World: Postcoloniality and the Ends of Comparison*. Stanford UP, 2007.

Mirze, Z. Esra. "Implementing Disform: An Interview with Orhan Pamuk." *PMLA* 123.1 (2008): 176-180.

Moore, Fabienne. *Prose Poems of the French Enlightenment: Delimiting Genre*. Ashgate, 2009.

Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. İletişim Yayınları, 1996 [1983].

Moretti, Franco. *Distant Reading*. Verso Books, 2013.

---. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. Verso Books, 2005.

---. "More Conjectures" *New Left Review* 20 (2003): 73- 81.

---. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54-68.

Newton, Charles. *Images of the Ottoman Empire.* Harry N. Abrams, 2007.

Ortaylı, İlber. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Aile*. Pan Yayıncılık, 2006.

---. *Osmanlıyı Yeniden Keşfetmek* [Rediscovering the Ottomans]. Timaş Yayınları, 2006.

Özkırımlı, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. Palgrave, 2000.

Özön, Mustafa Nihat. *Türkçe'de Roman*. İletişim Yayınları, 2009.

---. *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Maarif Vekaleti, 1941.

Paker, Saliha. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2002.

Parla, Jale. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İletişim Yayınları, 2011.

---. "The Wounded Tongue: Turkey's Language Reform and the Canonicity of the Novel" *PMLA* 123:1 (2008). 27-40.

---. "The Object of Comparison." *Comparative Literature Studies* 41:1 (2004): 116-125.

---. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Döneminin Epistemolojik Temelleri.* İletişim Yayınları, 1990.

Pamuk, Orhan. *Author Profile: Orhan Pamuk. World Literature Today* 79.1 (2005): 62.

---. *Istanbul: Memories of a City*. Trans. Maureen Freely. Faber and Faber, 2005.

---. *Manzaradan Parçalar: Hayat, Sokaklar, Edebiyat*. İletişim Yayınları, 2010.

---. *The Museum of Innocence*. Trans. Maureen Freely. Knopf, 2009.

---. *Other Colors: Essays and A Story.* Trans. Maureen Freely. Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.

---. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdağ Göknar. Vintage Books, 2001.

---. *The Naive and Sentimental Novelist*. Trans. Namık Dikbaş. Harvard UP, 2010.

---. "What We Think of America." *Granta* 77 (2002): 64-66.

---. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi" *Defter* 23 (1995): 31-45.

---. *The White Castle*. Vintage Books, 1990.

Pekin, Ersu. "Music at the Ottoman Court." January 10, 2014, www.turkishmusicportal.org/article.php?id=5&lang2=en.

Philliou, Christine M. *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution*. University of California Press, 2011.

Pope, Hugh, and Nicole Pope. *Turkey Unveiled: A History of Modern Turkey*. Overlook Press, 2000.

Renda, Gürsel and Samih Rifat. *Portraits from the Empire: The Ottoman World and the Ottomans from the 18th to 20th Century with Selected Works of Art from the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Collection*. Istanbul: Pera Museum Publications, 2006.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *The Oxford History of the Crusades*. Oxford UP, 2002.

Robbins, Bruce. Robbins, Bruce. "Introduction." *Perpetual War: Cosmopolitanism from the Viewpoint of Violence.* Duke UP, 2012.

Robinson, Richard D. *The First Turkish Republic: A Case Study in National Development.* Harvard UP, 1963.

Said. Edward W. *Orientalism.* Vintage Books, 1978.

---. "Introduction" *Mimesis.* Preface. Princeton UP, 2003.

Saussy, Haun. Ed. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization.* John Hopkins UP, 2006.

Seyhan, Azade. *Tales of Crossed Destinies: The Modern Turkish Novel in a Comparative Context.* Modern Language Association of America, 2008.

---. *Writing outside the Nation.* Princeton UP, 2001.

Sezer, Devrim. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Peyami Safa on Europe and Modernity" *History of European Ideas* 36.4 (2010): 427-437.

Shaw, Wendy M. K. *Ottoman Painting: Reflections of Western Art from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic*. I. B. Tauris, 2011.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. UP of New England, 2000.

---. *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. Routledge, 1998.

---. *Theories of Nationalism.* Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1983.

Smith, Joan. "Joan Smith Reports on Orhan Pamuk's Trial Hearing." English PEN, January 9, 2006.

Snyder, Louis. *The Meaning of Nationalism.* Rutgers UP, 1954.

Soykut, Mustafa. *Historical Image of the Turk in Europe: 15th Century to the Present: Political and Civilisational Aspects*. The Isis Press, 2003.

---. *The New Nationalism*. Cornell UP, 1968.

Suraiya, Faroqhi. *The Ottoman Empire and the World around It*. I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Şerif Mardin, "European Culture and the Development of Modern Turkey," in *Turkey and the European Community*. Eds. Ahmet Evin and Geoffrey Denton Leske u. Budrich, 1990.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *A Mind at Peace*. Trans. Erdağ Göknar. Archipelago Books, 2008.

---. *Beş Şehir*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000.

---. *Edebiyat Dersleri: Gözde Sağnak, Ali F. Karamanoğlu ve Mehmed Çavuşoğlu'nun Ders Notları.* Ed. Abdullah Uçman. Dergâh Yayınları, 2013.

---. *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. 3rd Edition. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Dergâh Yayınları, 1992.

---. *Mücevherlerin Sırrı: Derlenmiş Yazılar, Anket ve Röportajlar*. Eds. İlyas Dirin, Turgay Anay, and Şaban Özdemir. Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

---. *The Time Regulation Institute.* Trans. Alexander Dawe and Maureen Freely. Penguin Books, 2014.

Taşdemirci, Ersoy. *Belgelerle 1933 Üniversite Reformunda Yabancı Bilim Adamları.* [Foreign Scholars in 1933 University Reform]. Bizim Büro Basımevi, 1992.

Uğurlu, Alev Sınar. "Türk Romancısının Gözüyle II. Dünya Savaşı." *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 4.1 (2009): 1740-1764.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. University of California Press, 1965.

Zurcher, Erik J. *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building*. I.B. Tauris, 2010.